

THE  
REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

NO. 3.—JULY, 1885.

---

I.

THE AMERICAN CONGRESS OF CHURCHES.

BY PROF. THOS. G. APPLE, D. D.

THIS is rather a high-sounding title, it must be confessed, to be applied to the ecclesiastical meeting recently held in the old town of Hartford. It could hardly assume to be a meeting of *churches* at all, for the men assembled there were not delegated by their respective denominations. It was rather a meeting of Christians, as Bishop Coxe said he thought it might more properly be named. Neither does the title "congress" appear to us a very fitting title for such an assembly. It is a title little known, if known at all, in church history, being most generally applied to legislative and advisory bodies in the sphere of the state.

But the title is of little importance compared with the meeting itself. This, it must be acknowledged, had no little significance and importance, if we consider the preparation for it going before, the objects it had in view, and the distinguished men who were present. It had a preparation, in a general way, in the growing feeling of church union that has been asserting itself in different ways of late years among all branches of the

Protestant Church, and particularly in the active movement that has been going on for some time among ministers of different denominations in the city of Hartford.

The objects of the meetings were certainly of grave importance, to cultivate fellowship among the churches, to discuss the subject of Christianity, and to aid in preparing for such unity in a practical way.\*

Then, the men that met in the assembly and read able papers, are not only prominent in their own ecclesiastical bodies, but their ability and earnestness are conceded and recognized throughout the country generally. Such men as Bishop Coxe, Dr. Howard Crosby, Dr. James Freeman Clarke, President Porter, and others of like prominence, certainly give dignity and weight to such an assembly.

And yet we feel somewhat disappointed in the general result of the meeting as well as in some, if not most, of the papers read. We expected something more from Dr. Crosby than the propositions in which he presented his views on the important subject.† *First*, he says, "the union must subordinate all

\*These objects were outlined in the following words by Dr. Barker in his address of welcome:

"It has a worthy object, a catholic basis, simplicity of aim, freedom of organization, and an instrumental idea which, on a smaller scale, has been operated with marked success. It seems admirably adapted for the correction of various defects in our American Christendom. It will provide a freer interchange of opinions and a better mutual acquaintance among the sects, and so mitigate, if not terminate their rivalries and antagonisms. It will do much to banish petty ecclesiastical and theological provincialisms by substituting for the village diagram of divine things cosmoramic views of the Kingdom of God, and by diffusing a more cosmopolitan spirit." Political unity or consolidation is impracticable and undesirable. We need harmony not monotony."

† Dr. Crosby's propositions as reported in the *Independent*, are as follows:

"(1.) The union must subordinate all externals. There is no priest-code in the New Testament. The old ritual idea is swallowed up in the spiritual. The only restriction to be placed on the free choice of forms and methods is that of conformity to spiritual life.

externals. The old ritual is swallowed up in the spiritual, etc." If this means that the old Jewish ritualism is superseded, it is such a truism that one would wonder that he should travel all the way from Brooklyn to Hartford to announce it. That externals should be in proper subordination to the inward spiritual life of the church, is also a very commonplace truism. If it is meant, however, that external forms should be swallowed up in the spiritual, in the sense of being set aside or destroyed, then the proposition is an absurdity, for form is just as necessary as life; the latter cannot be without the former. The outward form of the Word of God, for instance, is something without which we could not receive the meaning or spirit of that revelation. Of like necessity is the outward form in the sacraments as related to the inward grace of the same.

The second proposition, that the spiritual character of the church must be emphasized, is very nearly the same thing, and the third, that there must be a suitable grading of doctrine, so as to distinguish between what is essential or primary and what is secondary, is very good, but this, too, is everywhere acknowl-

"(2.) The spiritual character of the church must be emphasized. Discipline must be maintained. There should be no compromise with unworthy persons, no matter what may be their commercial value.

"(3.) There must be suitable grading of doctrine. The vital truths, without which one cannot become a Christian, are in all the churches, and must be maintained."

These are excellent propositions in themselves considered. The difficulty is in applying them to the promotion of church unity. The first is somewhat doubtful, for, as stated in the text of our article, if it refers to forms, other than Jewish, the church cannot exist without them in some degree, and it leaves the question unanswered, how are they to be restricted to conformity to spiritual life?

The second needs only to be guarded against the spirit of Donatism, which would limit membership in the visible church to truly regenerate persons, and identifies the church with the kingdom of heaven, a spirit reproduced in the early Puritan theocracy of New England, which collapsed after a trial of about sixty years.

The third leaves undetermined the distinction between essential and non-essential doctrines. No doubt Dr. Crosby's remarks added much to the propositions.

edged. The difficulty here lies in uniting upon such a distinction, and so far as reported Dr. Crosby gives us no help in this direction. Surely it could not require much time or thought for a mind like his to prepare such propositions as these.

\* The subject of worship very properly came up for consideration, for it is felt by all that this has much to do with church unity. Single denominations give much attention to their order of worship, because it largely distinguishes and determines their denominational unity. The papers read on this subject, and the discussion that followed, it is reported, were all one way, in sympathy with liturgical worship, and a writer in the *Independent* regrets that there were no speeches on the anti-liturgical side. It would seem that on this subject, at least, the form had swallowed up the spiritual, right in the face of Dr. Crosby's assertion that "the old ritual ideas were swallowed up in the spiritual." Prof. Samuel M. Hopkins, of the Auburn Theological Seminary, though a Presbyterian, dealt some heavy blows at unliturgical worship, which, he said,

\* Dr. N. J. Burton, of Hartford, read an essay on this subject, in which he said that "Life is a supernatural one quickened by Christ. Worship, as the vehicle of truth to the mind" (a strange conception of the function of worship!) "cannot do its whole good work except as it is formulated and prescribed by authority. Worship sets forth the essential truths in a way to win men to the acceptance of the same. When we hear in worship the testimony and hallelujah of the whole militant Church, deep conviction is wrought in us, and our thorough indoctrination goes on apace."

One feels like suggesting that this purpose is accomplished better by the preaching of the Gospel, though it is true also that sound forms of worship do serve to preserve sound doctrine.

Prof. Samuel M. Hopkins, of the Auburn Theological Seminary (Presbyterian), also read a paper on liturgical worship. The reporter for the *Independent* says that "It was certainly unfortunate that no man representing the anti-liturgical side of the question was appointed to read a paper on this topic. The talk of the morning was all one way, and the discussion of a two-sided question was very one-sided, though able and interesting." Dr. Ormiston was unwell, but where was Dr. Crosby? It would indeed seem that New England in these later times takes kindly to liturgical worship as well as to *new theology*!



"is not for its own sake, but for the sake of the homiletical oration that follows it." There is, doubtless, only too much truth in this, but it is equally true that often where ritualism prevails the sermon is a mere tail to the kite. If we read the signs of the times aright, it would seem that a moderate use of liturgical forms is rapidly gaining favor in all the churches. Even the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland have a quite full liturgy prepared for them, including a regular Lord's day service, and all churches that prefer to do so are at perfect liberty to use it. It is now conceded that there is nothing in the Presbyterian system to forbid the use of a liturgy, and the discussion of this subject in the last meeting of the Reformed Alliance in Belfast, showed a strong leaning towards liturgical worship even among Presbyterians.

No one can question the influence exerted by liturgical worship in promoting and strengthening church unity. We merely assert the fact, without raising the question as to the comparative advantages in other respects of liturgical or unliturgical worship. It is generally conceded that the Book of Common Prayer has been a great moulding power in promoting the unity of the Episcopal Church and in attaching its members to it. There is a feeling that while the forms of worship may not be uniform in all portions of the church, yet there should be a uniformity at least in the general order of the parts of service in the same denomination. This is a bond of union. Members feel at home in the service when they find it the same wherever they worship within the bounds of their own denomination.

But church unity, after all, is not brought to pass by forms of worship. This latter depends rather on the former. Nor can the adoption of a liturgy heal church divisions. In some cases such adoption may produce divisions. Churches fight battles over liturgies as well as over creeds and confessions.

\* The most encouraging discussion, in our estimation, was

\* Dr. E. G. Robinson, President of Brown University, said: "The historic Christ is the Christ of the Gospels, a crucified, risen, glorified

that which took place towards the close of the meetings, in reference to the person of Christ in relation to confessions, or doctrinal beliefs. It grew out of a paper read by Dr. James Freeman Clark on "The Historical Christ considered as the Centre of Theology." Here at last a vital point was brought forward, and one that, more than any other, is at present agitating the Christian world. The question contained in this thesis relates to a principle, a central principle.

What shall be taken as the central principle in theology? In our Reformed Church this question has been answered for many years. Before the evil of sectarian divisions was acknowledged in other Protestant bodies in this country, over a quarter of a century ago, our church had begun to organize its theology around the Christological principle.

In the last two numbers of the *Andover Review*, May and June, editorials have appeared on this theme. In the June number the subject of the Incarnation is especially considered. The idea is brought out that we must seek for the center of theology not in what Christ did, but primarily in what He became and is, for man. The revelation in His person reaches deeper than the redemptive work He accomplished. Revelation

Person, both divine and human. Salvation is by Christ and not by the church. Salvation is by Christ, and not by some plan of the atonement. of you believe in this or that or the other theory or scheme, you are orthodox or heretical, according to your geographical position. The historical Christ is the true centre of theology as against all metaphysical and doctrinal standpoints. Christ completes and gives us the true idea of God. Metaphysics could never do this. Starting with Christ, we get the true idea of man also."

Similar expressions occur also in the paper read by Dr. James Freeman Clark, and were asserted in the speech of President Porter. All this certainly indicates the favor with which the Christological principle is received. So far it is good. We must not forget, however, that in the Corinthian church even the Christ party was a schismatic party. Even Unitarians, in words at least, advocate the Christological standpoint in theology, but if by it a mere theory or doctrine in regard to Christ is meant, it will not lift us above the strife about words, and while Unitarians laud Christ, do they not at the same time take away from Him His crown, by denying his absolute divinity?

is deeper than redemption. In reading these papers we seemed to be carried back thirty or thirty-five years, when this great theme formed the burden of earnest and able discussion in the pages of the *Mercersburg Review*. We became familiar then with the terms "Christocentric" and "Christological," when as yet they were scarcely ever, if ever, used in the theological writings of other denominations in this country. Now this Christological principle is given in the *Andover Review* as one of the characteristics of what is coming to be styled "the new theology."

It is worth while to pause and consider how far this principle, if made central in theology, will help to solve the problem of greater unity among the churches. So far as doctrine is concerned it unquestionably is the true central principle, and its recognition as such not only will work, but is already working, a revolution in theology.

In the sphere of doctrine the problem is, not how to secure uniformity or sameness, but rather harmony in difference. The former was reached in the Roman Catholic Church, and is still maintained in that church. It is an agreement secured by an external authority and at the sacrifice of the freedom of thought. Instead of being a good, therefore, it is an evil. Protestantism, by removing this external authority and making room for freedom of thought in theology, carried with it a tendency to produce variety in religious thinking. This in itself is not an evil. It is simply an impossibility that all minds should apprehend the truth in the same way—after the same formulas. It is of the very nature of life that it should develop in variety. This tendency reveals its fulness and fruitfulness. This is, indeed, one of the strongest apologies for the divisions in Protestantism. It is better to have growth with differences, than sameness and agreement in stagnation, or by suppression. The differences in Protestant confessions and theologies are, in the end, a real gain for the cause of truth. These theological differences are, in part, caused by the inability of the mind to comprehend the whole truth (only Christ

could do that) and so they complement each other. The different varieties and shade of Christian doctrine that have been evolved by earnest controversies and contests, often through violence, have served to bring out the many sides of truth.

What is needed now is, not to undervalue the importance of sound doctrine, not to indulge a latitudinarian spirit, not to attempt to substitute pious feeling for sound thought, nor even to undertake to elevate the practical in Christian life and experience at the expense of the theoretical, but *to seek for harmony in variety*. In this way what has been gained by Protestant freedom will be conserved, while the evil results of discord and division will be overcome.

And now in order to reach such substantial agreement and harmony, what is needed is that the church should unite on what may be called the true central principle of theology. This, we believe, must be found in the Christological principle. The adoption of such a central principle will not require that other important doctrines shall be given up, or even essentially changed, but that they should be differently related to each other and to the whole system of revealed truth.

Some of the apparently irreconcilable antagonisms in theological thought will find a new harmony in this reorganization, certain doctrines that were regarded as of central importance will be placed nearer the circumference of Christian faith, and thus the way will be opened for advancing the confessions of the Reformation to more satisfactory apprehension and statement.

Let us illustrate this by several examples. Take first the doctrine of the atonement. If we consider the different theories that have been given on this subject, that of a satisfaction made to Satan, of a satisfaction made to God, or a vindication of the divine government, or the moral theory advocated by Dr. Bushnell (though he changed his views on this before he died), we find that each contains a measure of truth but fails to give us the whole truth. If now we start with the person of Christ we find a principle that

goes deeper than all these and one that comprehends them all. The Word became flesh in order that He might bring our humanity into full harmony with God, and make it the receptacle and organ of divine life and love. When this was accomplished in His own person the way was prepared to make over its benefits to men, through their mystical union with Him by the Holy Spirit. From the standpoint of His divine-human person we can see how He could take upon Him man's guilt, not by an external, mechanical, imputation, but by virtue of His real assumption of human nature. As the last Adam, the true head of the race, He assumed in the most real way all the responsibilities and burdens that rested upon humanity, even though personally He had no sin. As the father bears the honor or dishonor of his family by virtue of being its natural head, so, only in a deeper sense, Christ, standing in the centre of humanity, was able to really feel its heart throbs. It was not an external plan (plan of redemption as it is often called), much less a mere appearance or sham. And all this while He was Himself in full harmony with His Father and conscious of His love. In bringing our humanity back to harmony with God He found it necessary to destroy the power of Satan, even though it cost Him His life, which He laid down for the sheep, and in this sense He did make an offering to Satan. So also in His pure and holy life, and in His real suffering, He vindicated the divine government, and exhibited also the unfathomable love of God to man. All these elements of the doctrine of the atonement naturally fall into their places, while the underlying principle is found in His being the generic head of the race. And thus we get back to the real meaning of atonement in the old sense of the word as an atonement. True, this is not the Scriptural word, which is, of course, Greek and not English, but we get here a comprehension of all the elements in the idea of atonement, while each one is held in proper subordinate relation to the whole fact. The errors that have appeared consist largely in making some one of these elements to be the whole, in emphasizing it

unduly, and in getting thus a one-sided view. Princeton seems still to make the *Anselmic* theory the central one in relation to all others, and in addition makes the atonement the great central doctrine of divine revelation. Surely we get a more comprehensive view of the atonement by considering it in the light of the person of Christ.

Take again the principle of justification by faith, as brought forward by the Reformers, over against the semi-Pelagian position of the Roman Church. If we would escape here again the idea of external imputation of righteousness, we must find a basis for justification in the person of Christ as related to believers. There is nothing fictitious or magical in God's transferring the righteousness of Christ to them on condition of their faith, though it must be confessed that the manner in which the doctrine is often presented makes it have that appearance. If a person, on condition of faith, through the Holy Spirit, is made a member of Christ, as he partakes of a fallen life through his relation to the natural head of the race, then it appears at once that God's accounting him righteous rests, not upon a fiction, but upon a reality.

The divine sovereignty and the doctrine of election must be apprehended also in right relation to the person of Christ. The old Reformed confessions were sound in the way they were accustomed to state this, as being chosen *in Christ*, viewing the divine decree or will, not metaphysically as something abstract, but as actual, concrete and historical in Christ.

Again, if we seek to form a right conception of God we must seek such knowledge in Christ. It is true that there is a consciousness of God in man, and by the light of nature we may learn to know something of Him, even His eternal power and divinity, but the deepest revelation of God is that which confronts us in Christ. In Him God is revealed to us as our *Father*, and we can know Him truly only when we come to know Him in this character. Here it is that we are confronted with the deepest mystery of our Lord's person. It is not that we learn to know God through the teaching of Christ; this we do in

a measure, but that we have in *Him* the revelation and actual presence of God as our Heavenly Father, which means that the glorified humanity of Christ is the only possible form in which we can see and know God either here or hereafter. Passages might be multiplied to support this. Especially forcible is the language our Lord employs in John xiv. 7, *et seq.*, "If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also: from henceforth ye know Him, and have seen Him," etc.

The mind seeks for some metaphysical definition of God, but in Christ He is revealed in His ethical character, in His personal being. We are too much inclined to regard this as only a measurable revelation, and then to look beyond Christ for something more. We say to ourselves that this revelation is so far forth true, just as terms and appellations taken from human relations, *anthropomorphisms*, are used to designate God, because we cannot comprehend Him in His infinite being. There is some truth in this. Though we have an idea of the infinite, yet we can form no conception of it except in finite forms of thought. But we are in danger here of substituting a metaphysical abstraction in the place of God. And so we seek for something apart from Christ to complement for our thought the revelation in Christ. But this was just what our Saviour chides Philip for doing. "Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

But this great mystery of the absolute revelation of the Father in our Lord must be apprehended in the light of His glorification. Christ not only came in His incarnation to reveal to us who and what God is, but He is now and forever the only form in which God can be most fully known to us. It is plain, therefore, that the whole mystery of the being of God, as well as the mystery of redemption, is contained in the person of Christ, and the inference is very necessary and certain that we must find in Him the centre of all our knowledge of God—the centre of all theological science. Around this centre all Christian doctrines

revolve. This, therefore, is a centre for the unification of all theological thought. It is much to have found this centre. This is not in itself the harmonizing of all diversities of doctrine, but it puts us on the way towards that result. Endlessly diverse and various as are the modes of apprehending divine truth in the thinking of men, yet here is a centre that holds all doctrines in right relation to each other. And how widely different this is from much of the theological thinking both of the past and the present, according to which men have formed systems of the knowledge of God, and then brought in a sort of Christology afterwards, a conception of Christ as the means or instrument of man's redemption merely. According to which the person of Christ becomes a parenthesis, so to speak, in the unfolding of our knowledge of God; whereas He is the centre of the whole revelation, the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, the first and the last.

We have dwelt thus long on this subject because it was, according to our judgment, in every way by far the most important theme discussed in the Hartford Congress, and one that gives most promise in regard to the practical work they had in view, viz., the unification of the churches. We believe that our theologies will discover new agreement and harmony in proportion as they are built on the Christological principle. And along with this advance in theology, will come in due time also an advance in our Church confessions. It is too soon, perhaps, to form a conception as to the manner in which such advance will be made. There is a wide-spread and growing feeling that they need revision. Some limit this need to the style or form of expression merely, the removal of archaisms, etc.; some are strongly in favor of abbreviating them so as to include only what would be regarded as requirements necessary to a profession of faith in Christ, retaining the rest, indeed, but referring it to the sphere of theology; and still others look to a real advance and restatement of the doctrines themselves. We need not speculate on these matters; when the time is ripe they will determine themselves.



But we must hasten on. One point in our mind, but not considered by the Congress, closely connected with the preceding is, a deeper apprehension of the Christology of the written Word—the Bible, as a condition necessary to the bringing in of a greater unification of the churches. It is to be feared that in the minds of some the strong emphasis laid upon the historical Christ, is designed merely as a sort of defense in the midst of difficulties raised in regard to the written Word. Of course there has been, and still is, a wrong dependence on the Scriptures for the defense of Christianity. Such wrong dependence, no doubt, prevailed in the scholastic period of Protestantism. Christianity was regarded as resting on doctrine, and the Scriptures were resorted to merely in order to prove doctrine. The person of Christ was kept in the background, and it was too much overlooked that Christianity is a real, objective, life, a real new creation, whose reality can no more be questioned than the real existence of the works of nature or the social economy. There existed then a sort of Bibliolatry, and it was felt necessary in order to support this to maintain a theory of verbal inspiration that included even the punctuation of the Scriptures. That method of defence was largely given up when unbelief turned its attack against the person of Christ. The rationalism of Strauss and Bauer and Renan called forth a new defense, and it is this defense that constitutes the rich Christological literature of the later age. And it is this, no doubt, that also gradually directed attention to the Christological principle of which we have been speaking.

But now, what is called the new criticism of the Bible has awakened fears in the minds of some as to whether the doctrine of the inspiration of the written Word can stand. And this has led some to seek a relief from such fears in the new emphasis laid upon the person of Christ. If the inspiration of the Bible should not stand, they say, to themselves, if not to others, still the person of Christ is an eternal verity. Here we stand on safe ground. So far as such a feeling may prevail it involves a great danger. We do not think such a thought does exist in

the minds of those generally who are laboring in the higher criticism; they, for the most part at least, have no fear for the inspiration of the Word of God. But we need more than this merely negative attitude on this subject; we need to find, parallel with the advancing interest in the Christological principle, an advancing *Biblical principle* also. As in the sixteenth century these two, justification by faith, and the Bible the only rule of faith, the material and the formal principle of Protestantism, mutually strengthened and supported each other, so now the emphasis laid upon the person of Christ as presenting a new centre for theology, should be joined with a deeper apprehension of the Christology of the Bible, as a living power drawing Christians and churches nearer together. The incarnate Word and the written Word must be apprehended together as essentially one. New light flashed forth from the Scriptures in the time of the Reformation, and the Bible became enthroned anew in the faith of the church. *Christ and His Word* was inscribed upon their banners. The same must be done in order to realize a forward movement in the church and in theology now.

Is there a call, it may be asked, for such a deeper apprehension of *Christ in the Word*? And what precisely is meant by this? Let us briefly explain our meaning. The Bible has been the great treasury from which have been drawn the doctrines that go to make up the Protestant confessions. We need to see that there is one great doctrine there that is central to them all. "Ye do search the Scriptures, because in them ye think ye have eternal life; *and they are they which testify of Me.*" This is especially applicable to the Old Testament Scriptures, to which our Saviour referred in those words. He opened the eyes of His disciples, especially after His resurrection, to this truth, that His person and work constitute the burden of revelation in all the Scriptures, beginning with Moses and the prophets. Christ is the light and life of the Scriptures. Not only do they point everywhere to Him, but He inwardly illumines and glorifies them. They are the meeting-place where God meets the believer. Even the Holy Spirit does not

enlighten the soul separately from the Word. No man ever is, or ever can be, evangelized without the inspired Word of God. If that Word is the meeting-place between God and His people, it must also be a bond of union for the churches.

But what is meant by a *new* apprehension of the Bible? There can be no doubt that in different ages new realms of truth in the Scriptures became opened up for the apprehension of believers. In the sixteenth century it was the truth of salvation by grace *through faith* that opened its rich stores for those who were seeking God in sincerity. In the epoch we are approaching the church will exalt upon the throne, anew, as it were, the divine-human Lord, and His glory will shine forth anew from His inspired Word, and this will really become what men have often endeavored to make it, a common bond of union and harmony for all creeds and confessions.

It is truly a wonder, if not a standing miracle, how the Christian consciousness in every age has exalted the Bible above all other books, and how the faith of Christians has turned to it as containing within it a light to dispel the darkness of the world. This may, indeed, at times become something of a superstitious reverence for the mere letter, a sort of Bibliolatry, as we have designated it, but still, even in this distorted and misdirected form it stands as a testimony of the unique character of that Word. And, especially since the rise of Protestantism, every once in a while a sect arises that professes to plant itself on the Bible as above all human creeds and confessions, and as being itself the only creed the church requires. We know that this, too, rests largely on ignorance as to the necessity of creeds, for in their interpretation of the Bible they bring to it an unwritten creed that has found lodgment by tradition in their minds. Yet even in this we have a sort of blind assertion of a great Protestant principle, that the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and practice. If the church were properly prepared to apprehend the full spiritual sense of the Bible, and in the degree this could be done, the necessity for human confessions would measurably cease. Though even then there would still be difference and

individuality in appropriating, or rather, reproducing, the truth in the intelligence, yet the substantial verity of the revelation would be the same in all. It was this spiritual sense that our Saviour unveiled to the disciples when He expounded in all the Scriptures the things pertaining to Himself and the kingdom of heaven. That revelation in the written Word is still the medium for apprehending *Him* in the ineffable mystery of His divine-human person. How, indeed, can we know Christ? Certainly not by personal witness, for besides that being impossible to us now as it was possible to the disciples, even in their case Christ directed them to the Scriptures, to the Old Testament, as giving them a better revelation than any sensible apprehension of Him could give them. Certainly also not by direct agency of the Spirit, for the Spirit illumines *through the Word*, and not independently apart from the Word. It is a false spiritualism, or *spiritism*, that claims an inspiration by the Holy Spirit apart from the Word of God, whether taught by the early Montanists or the later Anabaptists.

This being so, we are driven to the conclusion that the revelation of the mystery of the person of Christ by the Spirit is joined with the Word of God. And thus the Christological principle, as it is called, may not be sundered from the Scriptures. And we learn from this, moreover, that the principle which regards the person of Christ central for all true theology, has to do not merely with the intellectual apprehension of doctrine, but also with the very life of the church and of individual believers. It is not for abstract speculation merely, but for the deepest experience of the new life. Hence we must ever hold to the mysterious oneness of the incarnate and the written Word. If a new apprehension of our Lord Jesus Christ as the illumining centre of all revelation must serve to promote a greater unity among the churches, by leading them to emphasize what is central, instead of having a distorted view by emphasizing unduly what is peripheral, with this must be joined a deeper apprehension of the internal sense of the written Word. And this view shows us the great importance of the discussions now

going on in regard to the Bible and the nature of its inspiration, just at the time also when the Christological principle is taking its commanding place in theology. Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day and forever. *Verbum Dei manet in eternum.*

One more point comes under our notice, which the movement toward church-union in Connecticut has not overlooked, viz., the union must be promoted by practical coöperation, in which the interest in a particular denomination becomes merged into the interest in the whole church—the church Catholic.

The growth of denominationalism has been so vigorous that it will be no light or easy matter to start a current in which this shall become subordinated to a broader life. Denominational development originated, partly, at least, in freedom of religious thought, and it has, therefore, been a good. It has been fostered by a commendable zeal to maintain purity of doctrine. Each denomination feels that its peculiarities of creed and cultus are important, and that the particular errors opposed to them should be condemned. In many cases a denomination has made great sacrifices for what it regards as important truth; it has suffered bitter persecution, it may be. Hence it feels that it has a legacy which it is bound to guard and protect. The present generation feel that they would be unfaithful, if not recreant, to their trust if they would regard lightly what has been transmitted to them by their ancestors. Moreover, each denomination expects that it may, in the course of time, stand among the prominent surviving bodies of the country. Other reasons will suggest themselves why these divisions should be maintained.

But of late years another current has evidently set in, and the sentiment is gaining ground that the interests of the whole church are more important than those of a section, and that where the two come into collision the latter should yield to the former. No one can fail to see that in this country a great deal of strength is wasted in denominational rivalry. This is the case to some extent in the older sections, but it is still more so

in the newer settlements in the great West. Towns whose religious wants could be met by one or two churches must have six, eight, or even ten churches. These churches are largely dependent on missionary support, and it cannot be denied that much of this support is wasted. Some of these towns, it may be said, are destined to grow rapidly, and this denominational rivalry, therefore, only anticipates and provides for future wants. But in many cases this rivalry is blind, and it often burdens a small town, having little prospect of growth, with a half-dozen organizations, more than half of which may never be needed. If the ground is already occupied by some orthodox body, why should not it be left to provide for growing wants by new organizations of that body?

This is coming to be felt more and more all over the land, and ministers and churches are seriously considering whether a method of coöperation may not take the place of rivalry, whether one church may not consider not only its own interest, but also that of other churches, and whether a measure of denominational sacrifice for the interests of Christianity in general may not, after all, be more commendable than partisan zeal. If such broad, Catholic spirit does not assert itself, our denominational rivalries will consume the spirit of charity and leave the defenses open to the common enemy.

Then, also, there are certain interests in a community which require a union of efforts among the churches, interests that pertain to the community as a whole. The inability to provide for these has given occasion for the rise of societies that are extra-ecclesiastical, such as Young Men's Christian Associations, Bible and Tract Societies, Temperance Societies, and many so-called Charitable Associations. We may maintain that the church, in its organized capacity, should have charge of the interests thus taken in hand by these outside bodies, but the fact is that the church does not take hold of them, and it is comparatively helpless to do so by reason of its want of general organization.

The movement in Connecticut has aimed to meet this want

in a given locality. The ministers in a certain city inaugurated measures of coöperation, with a view to husband their resources, and bring the united activity of the churches to bear upon certain wants of the community. Such an experiment is certainly worthy of being tried, and with the spirit of union that is now making itself felt in all directions among the churches, it will not long remain an isolated experiment, nor an experiment at all. Our large cities especially require such coöperation. It is becoming a serious question whether civilization can be maintained in them before the terrible development of vice and barbarism. Certainly a united enemy here requires that Christianity should unite its forces. Earnest men in Europe and America have been studying the question, What is to be the fate of the churches in our large cities? It is a question now brought forward in all great ecclesiastical assemblies. If they cannot stem the tide of iniquity, then the Lord have mercy upon such cities. The only remedy must be in their temporary destruction, some terrible calamity that may weaken and check the natural forces that are rushing into the jaws of hell.

Our hope in such movements as this American Congress of Churches is not so much in anything they have yet accomplished, as in the deep want rather which they reveal. It is something to have the public mind of the Church aroused to the magnitude of the evil and the peril that confront Christianity in these times. Perhaps peril must develop into disaster, danger be followed by persecution and suffering, before the Church can be united in its work. Certainly the times are ominous. The social fabric, both in Europe and America, rocks and quakes as though threatened by some terrible upheaval. This is not the sentiment of an alarmist, but it is the sober judgment of the most thoughtful, earnest Christian men on both sides of the ocean.

It is not a mere external consolidation of the Church that is needed. Even if that were accomplished, it would require subordinate organizations to be formed to perform its various

functions ; but what is required is that the parts and functions shall work in harmony and coöperation ; and to reach that it is necessary that interest in particular denominations shall be subordinated to interest in the whole. All may not indeed be able to reach this in a tangible way. There are good, faithful, citizens whose interest never passes beyond the county in which they live, but still they are true men, and if the occasion should arise their local interest would soon expand into true national patriotism. But those who are called to lead and direct the general movements of the Church, and to bring its activities to bear upon the wants and evils of society, they need to do this in a broad, catholic spirit, and not with a narrow zeal that concerns itself only for its own body or sect. Not only should such a liberal spirit bind together all Protestant bodies, but the time is coming when Catholic and Protestant must work together for a common Christianity. On subjects that concern the welfare of society in its general character, such as education, the sacredness of the family as based on the divine institution of marriage (and attacked not only by Mormon polygamy, but our loose divorce laws and prevailing licentiousness), the Sabbath, temperance, etc., they need to unite their forces against a common foe. Instead of debating in great Presbyterian Assemblies whether Roman Catholic baptism is valid, or fulminating from pope and council anathemas against Protestant churches, they need to see to it that the devil does not vanquish both. Surely the enemy they have been sent forth to subdue is not so insignificant that they can afford to get up a contest with each other, as a sort of theological diversion. The perils of the age are quite too serious for that. The time has come when the whole power of Christianity is required to save the civilized nations of the world from lapsing into worse than barbarism.



## II.

### THE POEM OF THE FALL OF MAN.

BY PROF. CHAS. A. BRIGGS, D.D.

THE earlier chapters of Genesis contain a series of brief, simple and charming stories of the origin and early history of mankind, that bear the traces of great antiquity. They were doubtless handed down for many generations as unwritten tradition, ere they were committed to writing by the sacred writers. They passed through a series of editions, until, at last, they were compacted in that unique collection of inspired Scripture which we call the book of Genesis. The literary beauties of these stories have been recognized since Herder, by those who have studied the Scriptures with their æsthetic taste. Poetic features have been noticed by a number of scholars, but, so far as we know, no one has previously observed that they are a series of real poems. It was the good fortune of the author to make this discovery. Annual work upon these passages with his classes led him gradually towards it. He first noted a number of striking instances of parallelism of lines here and there, and thus detected snatches of poetry in several passages. These continued to enlarge, from year to year, until he was constrained to ask the question, how much real poetry there was in these ancient stories, and to apply the tests of poetic composition to the entire series. The first passage to disclose itself as poetry was the Elohist narrative of the creation. This proved to be a poem of six strophes, with refrains. The lines are pentameters, measured by five beats of the word accent, with the cæsura dividing the lines into two sections. The first and second strophes have seven lines each, the third, fourth and fifth strophes ten lines each, and the

sixth strophe twenty lines; thus increasing in length, according to a frequent usage of Hebrew poetry in hymns and descriptive poems.

All the characteristic features of Hebrew poetry are clearly manifested in the poem. We have given this piece of poetry to the public in the "*Old Testament Student*," April, 1884. This led us to examine the Elohist narrative of the flood, and it proved to be a poem of the same essential structure as the Elohist story of the creation. We next examined the Jehovistic narrative of the temptation and fall, and found it to be a poem of an entirely different structure from the poems of the Elohist. The lines of this poem are trimeters, and the strophes are regularly composed of fourteen lines each. We then examined the Jehovistic story of the flood, and found that it was a poem of the same structure as the Jehovistic poem of the fall. The stories of Cain and Abel, and the dispersion of the nations from Babel, resolved themselves into the same poetical structure. And thus it has become manifest that the earlier chapters of Genesis are a series of real poems, which have passed through the hands of several editors in the earlier collections of the Elohist and Jehovist, until at last they were compacted by the redactor of the Hexateuch into their present form.

If it be thought surprising that the poetical structure of these poems has so long been hidden from Hebrew scholars, it is sufficient to mention that Bishop Lowth, in the middle of the last century, was the first to discover and to unfold the essential principle of Hebrew poetry, namely, the parallelism of lines, and to show that the prophecies of the book of Isaiah were chiefly poetry. From time to time, during the past century, a large number of poetical extracts have been discovered in the historical books, as well as in the prophetic literature. The great majority of scholars have studied the Old Testament in the interests of dogma, or else of grammatical, historical or practical exegesis. Very few have studied the literary features of the Old Testament. The structure of the Hebrew strophe

and the measurement of the lines of Hebrew poetry are known to comparatively few Hebrew scholars.

We propose to limit ourselves for the present to the poem of the fall of mankind. This poem exhibits the several features of Hebrew poetry.

First. The lines show all the various features of parallelism that are found in other Hebrew poetry, synonymous, antithetical and progressive, and the several varieties of these. The lines are grouped in distichs, tristichs, tetrastichs, pentastichs, hexastichs, heptastichs, octostichs, nonastichs, decastichs, in accordance with the movement in the thought and the emotion. (See my *Biblical Study*, p. 264 sq.)

Second. The lines are trimeters with the exception of a very few broken lines, which are shortened in order to a pause in the thought, in accordance with the frequent usage of all Hebrew poetry of this measurement. The trimeters of Hebrew poetry are composed of three beats of the word accent. The Hebrew poet has the power of combining two or more short words by a makkeph under one word accent. (See *Biblical Study*, p. 279 sq.)

Third. The poem has strophical organization. It is composed of ten strophes of fourteen lines each. These are arranged in two groups. The first group is composed of four strophes, arranged on the principle of strophe and anti-strophe. The second is composed of two sets of three strophes each. The second set is balanced against the first set. The ten strophes are equal in the number of the lines. There are fourteen lines to each strophe. These strophes are always divided into two parts, but there is a considerable variety in the inter-relation of these parts. Thus the first strophe is composed of two heptastichs, the third and sixth strophes have a hexastich followed by an octostich. The fifth and seventh strophes reverse the order, and have an octostich followed by a hexastich. The second and tenth strophes have a pentastich followed by a nonastich. The eighth strophe reverses the order and gives a nonastich followed by a pentastich. The fourth strophe has

a decastich folowed by a tetrastich. (See *Biblical Study*, p. 272 and sq.).

Fourth. There are a considerable number of archaic words which belong to the language of Hebrew poetry: שִׁיחַ (II. 5); אֵד (II. 5); כִּנְנוֹר (II. 18, 20); תְּחִנָּה (II. 21); עֵרֶם (III. 7, 10, 11); הֶפֶר (III. 7); אֵיכָה (III. 9); אֵיכָה (III. 15); יְשׁוּפָן and תְּשׁוּפָנָה (III. 15); תְּשׁוּקָה (III. 16); קִיץ וְדָרָר (III. 18); יָעָה (III. 19); אַחֲרַי מִכְנִי (III. 22); לֵהָט (III. 24).

### 1.—*The Formation of the Man.*

In the day of God's making earth and heaven,  
No shrub of the field having yet appeared,  
And no herb of the field having yet sprouted;

For God had not rained upon the earth,  
And man there was none to till the ground;  
But a mist was ascending from the earth,  
And watering all the face of the ground;

Then God formed the man,  
Of dust from the ground,  
And breathed into his nostrils the breath of life,  
And the man became a living being.

And God planted a garden in Eden,  
And put therein the man,  
Whom he had formed.

This strophe is a temporal clause. The protasis gives the time and circumstances of the formation of man. The apodosis gives an account of the formation of man, and of the garden of Eden as his home. The protasis and apodosis are seven lines each, and are of the nature of strophe and antistrophe in the system of parallelism. The protasis is composed of an introductory line, giving a general statement as to time; a synonymous distich giving the circumstances, namely, the absence of vegetation suited to man, and the tetrastich of reasons for the absence of this vegetation. The apodosis gives a tetrastich, describing the formation of man, and a tristich representing the placing of him in the garden of Eden.

The poem doubtless used the divine name "*Elohim*." When

the poem was taken up into the Jehovistic narrative, it was supplied with editorial notes. Thus the divine name "*Jahveh*" is prefixed to Elohim, everywhere in chapter second, and generally in chapter third. It should be omitted altogether from the poem. It was probably a marginal note, and only at a later date incorporated with other notes in the text. It is also probable that בארץ in the second line, and מקום in the twelfth line are editorial notes. "In the earth" is a natural suggestion from the context, but it is prosaic. "In the East" is not appropriate to the poem. It is characteristic of the Jehovistic narrator to make just such geographical remarks. The lines of the strophe are all trimeters, with the exception of the last line which is shortened, in order to obtain a pause, and dwell upon the thought of the divine formation of man, which is the essential theme of the entire strophe.

The poetical structure guides to its interpretation. The time of the formation of man was that day in which God made earth and heaven. The poet thinks that the earth and heaven were created in a day of divine activity. Our poet thinks of a day, where the poem of the creation thinks of six days. There is a different poetical conception. Neither of these poets thought of a day of twenty-four hours, a day of man's labor and rest, but of days of divine activity. It is noteworthy that the two poems have the same syntactical structure in the formation of their strophes, namely, protasis, circumstantial clause, and apodosis. It is instructive to compare them, and to see the differences. The protasis of the poem of the creation contains a time-word בראשת in the construct state before the relative clause of time, with the perfect tense ברא and the objects created, "the heaven and the earth." The protasis of our poem contains another timeword ביום with the infinitive construct עשית, and the objects created "earth and heaven." The apodosis of the poem of the creation gives the creation of light. The apodosis of our poem the formation of man. As the apodosis of the poem of the creation leaps over the creation of the waste and empty earth, and

begins with the creation of light; so the apodosis of our poem leaps over the creation of earth and heaven and begins with the formation of man, the last of the divine creations in the poem of the creation. This difference in the apodosis involves a difference in the circumstantial clauses. The circumstances of the creation of light were a defect in the condition of the earth.

"The earth being waste and empty, and darkness upon the face of the deep,  
And the Spirit of God hovering over the face of the waters.

The circumstantial clause of our poem involves a corresponding defect.

"No shrub of the field having yet appeared,  
And no herb of the field having yet sprouted."

According to the poem of the creation vegetation appeared on the third day, midway between the creation of light and the creation of man. If the two poets thought of the same thing, there is a manifest disagreement. We might have appealed to the word "field" as implying a different kind of vegetation from that contemplated in the poem of the creation, but this would not be sufficiently evident.

We have, however, a sufficient guide to the meaning in the reasons assigned for the absence of this vegetation. First, God had not rained upon the earth; but instead of the rain the ground was watered by the mist. This is a reason for the absence of such vegetation as needed the sunlight and the rain; but this is no reason for the absence of the lower forms of vegetation, that thrive sufficiently well, without rain or sunshine, in ground watered by a mist. The second reason given is that man there was none to till the ground. This implies the absence of such vegetation as needed tillage, but is no reason for the absence of vegetation that thrives without tillage. These reasons seem to indicate that the shrubs and herbs, that had not yet appeared, were such as required sunshine, rain, and tillage, such as were especially for the use of man, such as the grains, the domestic fruits and plants; in

other words according to the next strophe, those that were planted by God in the garden for the use and care of man. At this time, and under these circumstances God created man and the garden, with such vegetation as was needed for his support.

In the apodosis God is represented as forming man as an individual, where the poem of the creation represents that man was created as a race. God is represented as a sculptor, forming or moulding the body of man *יצר*. The material which God uses is dust or soil *עפר* taken out of the ground. This sculptured form is represented as inanimate. Its life is derived from a second divine activity. God is represented as breathing or blowing into the nostrils of the body of man the breath of life. *נשמתחיים*. The life originates from the breath that proceeds from the mouth of God. Thus man originates from two divine activities: the body is formed by the divine fingers, and the life is imparted by the divine breath. The result of both is that man becomes a living being. The earth was not suited for the abode of man: hence God plants a garden for him. This garden is placed in Eden, a section of the earth. The author thus conceives of a three-fold division of the earth: the earth itself, Eden and the garden; somewhat after the manner of the three grades of access to God as represented in the structure of the tabernacle and the temple.

God is graphically represented as a gardener, planting shrubs and herbage and trees for the use of the man; and the man is designed to be a gardener to till the ground under the divine direction. The poet conceives that God was really present in human form. He has in mind a *theophany*. This conception is true to the scope and method of divine revelation in the Old Testament. The story is not to be resolved into a lifeless anthropomorphism of abstract dogma, on the one hand; or an unsubstantial highly-colored ideal, on the other. It is intensely realistic. The man was not formed by a divine fiat, or by a chain of secondary causes; God appears in theophany, and the first man originates from His fingers and breath. A divine advent in theophany was necessary at the creation, as well as at the redemption and final judgment.

*II. The Garden in Eden.*

And God caused to sprout from the ground,  
 Every tree desirable in appearance,  
 And (every tree) good for eating,  
 And the tree of life in the midst of the garden,  
 And the tree of knowing good and evil.

And a river was flowing forth from Eden,  
 Watering the garden and thence dividing itself.  
 And becoming four heads:  
 The name of the first Pishon,  
 And the name of the second river Gihon,  
 And the name of the third river is Hiddekel,  
 And the fourth river is Euphrates.

And God took the man,  
 And placed him in the garden of Eden to till it.

This strophe gives an account of the garden of Eden. It is composed of two parts: a pentastich and a nonastich. The pentastich is composed of an introductory line representing the divine agency in the production of the trees, and four synonymous lines giving the kinds of trees. The nonastich is composed of a tristich describing the river and its dividing itself into four channels; the tetrastich giving the names of the channels, and the distich describing the placing of man in the garden of Eden. This strophe is furnished with editorial notes describing the geographical position of the rivers.

The Pishon. ("That is the one that meanders through the whole land of Havila, where there is gold, and the gold of that land is excellent. There is the bdellium and the onyx stone.")

The Gihon. ("That is the one which meanders through the whole land of Cush.")

The Hiddekel. ("That is the one which flows in front of Assyria.") We must also regard as an editorial note, לשטירה (*to keep it*). It seems to us also necessary to insert the words "every tree" in the third line.

The strophe begins with an account of the production of the trees in the garden of Eden. As the man had been formed



out of the dust of the ground, so the trees were to sprout from the ground. Man and the trees are composed of the same material substance. The trees take the place of the shrubs and plants of the previous strophe. There are four kinds of trees, which may be arranged in two classes: trees for beauty and trees for fruit. There are two trees mentioned of especial importance: the tree of life in the midst of the garden, which was a fruit-tree, whose fruit secured the perpetuation of life. Over against the tree of life was the tree of the knowing of good and evil. This seems to belong to the class of trees of beauty. It was given the property of imparting the knowledge of good and evil.

The garden was watered by four streams. These streams were channels of the one river which flowed from the land of Eden into the garden of Eden. At its very entrance into the garden it divided itself into four channels in order to irrigate it.

The river and its streams take the place of the rain of the previous strophe, as the trees take the place of its shrubs and herbs. It is not necessary to think of the delta of a great river. The poet conceives of a garden. God is the gardener: as He plants the trees of the garden, so He divides up the river into four channels for the purpose of watering the garden. The division of the river for purposes of irrigation is as much the gardener's work as the planting of the trees. The poet gives the names of these streams. A later editor endeavors to give their geographical position; but with such obscurity that, notwithstanding volumes of fruitless discussion, no one has yet been able to discover the original home of our race. The man was placed in this garden of trees and streams to till it. The previous strophe represents that there were no trees and shrubs, because there was no man to till them, and there was no rain to water them. This strophe now gives the man, and the rivers, and the trees. The garden needed the man as much as the man needed the garden. This strophe is an anti-strophe to the previous one.

*III. The Charge to the Man.*

And God charged upon the man :  
 Of all the trees of the garden thou mayest freely eat,  
 But of the tree of knowing good and evil,  
 Thou shalt not eat of it ;  
 For in the day of thy eating of it,  
 Thou shalt utterly die.

And God said, It is not well,  
 The continuing of the man by himself ;  
 I shall make him a help as his counterpart.

And God formed from the ground  
 All the animals of the field,  
 And all the birds of heaven,  
 And brought them all to the man,  
 To see what he would call them.

This strophe is divided into a hexastich and an octostich. The hexastich gives the divine charge to the man with reference to the trees. The octostich the bringing of the animals to the man. The hexastich is composed of three distichs. The octostich is composed of a distich and pentastich. There are two editorial notes in this strophe. לאמר at the close of the first line and the clause "and whatever the man called the living beings that was its name." In this strophe God gives the man a solemn charge granting him the privilege of eating of all the trees of the garden with the single exception of the tree of knowing good and evil. This tree was prohibited under the penalty of death. The eating of all the other trees involved the privilege of eating of the tree of life and living forever. The privilege was given to *freely* eat of them. The tree of the knowing good and evil was entirely prohibited under the penalty of utter, entire, complete death. The knowing of good and evil was imparted in the very presence of the forbidden tree. It was ever good to eat of the tree of life and the other trees in the garden ; it was ever evil to eat of the prohibited tree. The prohibition discriminated between good and evil, between life and death. The eating of the tree of life gave the experimental knowledge of the good,

the looking at the tree of the knowing of good and evil gave theoretical knowledge of evil. The two trees were for the religious training of the man. The longer the abstinence from the evil and the enjoyment of the good continued, the higher the religious development of man. Such a discrimination was indeed necessary for the ethical developments of human nature. No discrimination could have been made more simple and appropriate for the beginning of the ethical development of mankind. The second part of the strophe represents the intellectual and social developments of man. The poem of the creation represents that mankind was created as a race the last work,—of God. Our poet, however, proposes to give an account of the origin and development of this race from a single individual. There is something defective in the condition of the man in the garden of Eden alone by himself. He needs a companion, his counterpart. God trains him to recognize this need. Animals are brought to man in order for him to learn that they are not his companions. These animals were formed from the dust of the ground by God, as man himself had been. Man and animals are made of the same material substance. These animals are probably the higher animals designed by the creator for the garden of Eden to be the especial servants of man.

It is probable that the poet has in mind the domestic animals of Eden and not the wild animals of the outer earth. The poet limits himself to the garden of Eden and its inhabitants. These animals are named by man, and are recognised to be a different kind of beings from himself. He does not find his counterpart in any of them. This naming of the animals is the training of man, not only in the intellectual perception but also of conception and speech. It is natural to suppose that our poet is thinking of the gift of speech as the peculiar endowment of man and that this recognition of his own exclusive possession of this faculty made it evident to him that the animals were his servants and could not be his companions.

*IV. The Formation of the Woman.*

When the man had given names  
 To all cattle and to the birds of heaven,  
 And to all the animals of the field,  
 And for the man a helper, a counterpart, He had not found,

God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man,  
 And when he slept, took one of his ribs,  
 And closed up flesh in its place;  
 And God built the rib,  
 Which he had taken from the man,  
 Into a woman, and brought her unto the man;

And the man said, This now—  
 Bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh—  
 This shall be called woman;  
 For from man has she been taken.

This strophe is composed of two parts,—decastich and tetrastich. The decastich is divided into tetrastich and hexastich. The Masoretic text has אדם without the article in the fourth line, but it should be supplied in accordance with the usage of the poem throughout. This strophe is also supplied with an editorial note at the end as follows: "Wherefore man is accustomed to leave his father and his mother and cleave unto his wife, so that they become one flesh." And they were both of them naked, the man and his wife, and they were not ashamed. The first part of the strophe is a temporal clause. The protasis in four lines states the fact that a companion was not found among the animals and that the man needed one like himself. The apodosis describes the creation of the woman. God might have formed the woman as he did the man, out of the dust of the ground, but it was his design that the woman should originate from the man. The poet changes the figure. God is now represented as performing a surgical operation upon the man. He causes him to fall into an unconscious condition as if under the influence of an anæsthetic. He then removes one of the ribs of the man and replaces it with flesh, and heals the wound. This rib he builds up into the woman. God is represented as

forming the man by moulding him out of the dust of the ground, under the image of a sculptor; so now he is represented as forming the woman by erecting her out of the rib of the man, under the image of an architect or builder. The material out of which man was made was the dust of the ground, the material out of which woman is made is that dust transformed into the rib of the man. Hence it is that in the second part of the strophe, when God brought the woman unto the man that the man recognizes the woman as made out of his flesh and bone, a part of his very self, his counterpart.

This fourth strophe is the anti-strophe to the third. The third strophe presents us with something defective in the condition and circumstances of the man. Provision is made for his religious and intellectual culture. The fourth strophe now shows that the intellectual training has led man to a sense of his need of a companion like himself; and the defect is supplied by the erection of the woman, and man's recognition of her as his counterpart.

#### *V. The Temptation.*

Then the serpent said unto the woman :  
Is it true that God hath said,  
Ye shall not eat of any of the trees of the garden ?

The woman said unto the Serpent,  
Of the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat ;  
But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden,  
God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it,  
And ye shall not touch it lest ye die.

Then the Serpent said to the woman,  
Ye shall not die at all ;  
For God well knows,  
That in the day of your eating of it,  
Your eyes shall be open and ye shall become  
Like God, knowers of good and evil.

This strophe is composed of an octostich and a hexastich. The octostich is subdivided into a tristich and a pentastich. This strophe is furnished with an introductory editorial note :

"Now the serpent was more subtle than all the animals of the field which God had made." The serpent is introduced as a source of evil among the animals, as the tree of the knowing of good and evil had been among the trees. The human pair had learned to discriminate evil among the trees of the garden; they were now to learn to discriminate evil among the animals of the garden. The latter discrimination was first presented to the woman, as the former had been to the man. The woman in her reply to the serpent, shows that she understood the prohibition of the tree, and that they had learned to avoid it, and had not even touched it. There is something more in this tempting serpent than a serpent. There is intelligence, conception, speech and knowledge higher than that of the man or the woman. The woman knew that she had to deal not with a mere serpent, but with a higher power, a spiritual intelligence, who had entered the garden in hostility to the Creator, to deliver the man and the woman from His sway. As God assumes human form, in order to the creation and training of the human pair in the garden of Eden; so now a hostile evil spirit assumes the form of the serpent to deceive them and ruin them. Here, then, is an evil being, higher than man, rising up in hostility to God. Over against God's warning, "Ye shall utterly die," the serpent makes the assertion, "Ye shall not die at all." Instead of the tree bringing death, as God had said, the tree will open their eyes and make them equal with God. Thus evil has come to the human pair in its highest form. They had withstood the temptation to evil in the tree alone. The unintelligent animal would not have succeeded in enticing them to transgression. But when the evil intelligence, which is wiser than themselves, uses the tree and the animal, they are put in extreme jeopardy. The poet does not propose to give an account of the origin of evil. That is beyond the scope of his story; in the dark and mysterious background of his picture, in the higher world of spiritual intelligences. The poet shows the evil as it enters into Eden from without, under the divine permission, to test the religious character of man, and give him the moral development

and growth that he needs in order to the perfection of his nature.

*VI. The Fall.*

When the woman saw,  
That the tree was good for eating,  
And that it was lovely to the eyes,  
And the tree was desirable to give wisdom;  
She took of the fruit and ate,  
And gave also to her husband with her.

When he had eaten, the eyes of them both were opened,  
And they knew that they were naked,  
And they sewed fig leaves,  
And made for themselves girdles.

And when they heard the sound of God,  
Walking in the garden at the breeze of the day,  
The man and the woman hid themselves,  
From the face of God in the midst of the trees of the garden.

This strophe is composed of two parts, a hexastich and an octostich. The octostich is subdivided into two tetrastichs. The first line is a broken line. We disregard the Masoretic accents, and detach <sup>ל</sup>מִן from the sixth verse, and make it the beginning of the seventh verse of the chapter, and the seventh line of the strophe. The hexastich gives an account of the threefold attraction of the tree, in the light of the temptation by the serpent. It appeals to her physical appetite; "it was good for eating;" to her æsthetic taste, "it was lovely to the eyes;" and to her intelligence, "it was desirable to give wisdom." It seemed to be the very thing she most needed to satisfy all the cravings of her nature; and so she took of the fruit and ate, and gave also to her husband. The poet does not tell us of any additional influences brought upon the man by the woman to induce him to eat with her; but briefly indicates that the woman becomes the tempter of her husband, soliciting him with all the charms of her nature.

The octostich gives an account of the immediate consequences of the eating. It has often been asked, why we have

no divine interposition here to prevent the transgression. The poet does not answer such questions. He gives us little material for theological speculation. It might be said that this test had become necessary to the religious development of mankind. The tree, and the serpent, and the evil spirit all have their place in the divine plan for the education of the race. There can be no religious growth without trial, and victory over temptation. If evil in the tree and the animal had not been already overcome, the evil spirit would not have been admitted into the garden. They had advanced in their ethical developments to the position in which it was indispensable that they should submit to this highest test. The second Adam, the Redeemer, was obliged to submit to it, ere He could enter upon His public ministry of redemption. If God had interposed in theophany to prevent the external act of transgression, He would not thereby have prevented the fall. There still would have been the fall in the evil disposition to transgress. The failure to resist the temptation by the ability which God had given them, was the essential element in the fall. The time for divine interposition was not prior to the fall, but subsequent to it. It was better for man that the internal failure should result in the external transgression, with its evil consequences, for only thereby could there be possibility of redemption.

The result of the eating was the opening of the eyes to what they had never seen before, namely, the evil in themselves, in their own bodies, expressed as we may suppose, by a flush of shame, which they strove to hide from each other. The knowing of good was a past experience, and present theory as something external to themselves. The knowledge of evil, which had been theoretical, as something external to themselves in the serpent, and the tree, and the evil spirit, had now become experimental, as internal to their very nature. They have lost the experimental good, and gained the experimental evil. They have lost their likeness to God in the being good and becoming better, and have gained a likeness to the evil spirit



in being evil, with a tendency to become worse. The first tetrastich represents them as ashamed in the presence of each other, the second tetrastich represents them as ashamed in the presence of God. They strive to hide their shame from each other by fig leaves and girdles: they strive to hide their shame from God by plunging into the midst of the trees of the garden. The time for divine interposition has now come. They hear the sound of the approaching theophany in the evening of this day of transgression.

*VII.—The Divine Inquiry.*

When God called unto the man,  
And said to him, Where art thou? he said,  
Thy voice I heard in the garden,  
And I was afraid because I was naked.

And he said, Who told thee,  
That thou art naked?  
Of the tree hast thou eaten,  
Of which I commanded thee not to eat?

The man said, The woman—  
Whom thou gavest to be with me—  
She gave me of the tree.

And God said to the woman  
What then hast thou done? and she said,  
The serpent deceived me and I ate.

This strophe is composed of a double tetrastich, and a double tristich. We disregard the Masoretic accents, and detach וַיֹּאמֶר from the beginning of verse ten, and make it the closing word of verse nine. We transfer אָכַל, the last word of verse eleven, so as to immediately follow חָסַן הָעֵץ in the middle of the same verse. We regard וַאֲהֵבָא the last word of verse ten, and וַאֲכַל the last word of verse twelve, and הָאִשָּׁה at the beginning of the last line of the strophe, as prosaic additions by the Jehovistic editor.

God first calls the man to account, and says "Where art thou?" The confession of fear of the presence of God involves an acknowledgment of the sin. The second tetrastich gives

the second inquiry of God as to the source of the knowledge of nakedness, and a call for an exact account of the transgression. In the first tristich the man offers an excuse by referring to the woman. In the second tristich the woman offers an excuse by referring to the deception of the serpent. Thus the divine inquiry determines in a simple and graphic manner the exact measure of the guilt of each of the three parties to the transgression, involving three gradations of guilt, which are to receive their appropriate punishment.

*VIII.—The Punishment of the Serpent and of the Woman.*

And God said unto the Serpent,  
Because thou hast done this, cursed be thou,  
From all beasts and from all animals of the field,  
Upon thy belly thou shalt go,  
And dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life;  
And enmity will I put between thee and the woman,  
And between thy seed and her seed,  
He shall bruise thee on the head,  
And thou shalt bruise him on the heel.

And unto the woman (God) said,  
I will greatly increase thy sorrow,  
In sorrow shalt thou bear children,  
And unto thy husband will thy longing be,  
And he will rule over thee.

This strophe is composed of a nonastich and a pentastich. The nonastich is subdivided into a pentastich and a tetrastich. It seems probable that in the sixteenth verse *אלהים* should be inserted in the first line after *אמר*, and that *והרר* should be omitted at the close of the next line as an editorial note. The nonastich gives the curse of the serpent. It first in a tetrastich punishes the animal serpent with degradation of condition, banishment from the animals and trees of the garden, and condemnation to a life of crawling upon the ground in the dust. Some of the older interpreters have thought that the form of the serpent was changed. There is, however, nothing to suggest a change in the nature or form of the animal serpent. The curse has its significance in the degradation of its

condition and its life. The strophe then rises to the punishment of the evil spirit, which used the animal as his instrument. There is a prediction of a perpetual enmity not only between the woman and the serpent, but the entire race and descendants of the woman and the serpent. This enmity involves a perpetual conflict in which injury will be wrought on both sides. The wounds inflicted by the serpent are made in secret and in treachery, behind the back of man and beneath his feet on his heel. But the wounds inflicted by man upon the serpent are openly upon his head crushing him to death in the dust.

This enmity and conflict is to result in an eventual and final victory of man over the serpent. This conflict and victory is something more than a mere dislike and hostility to snakes; it is a conflict in which man is to bear a brave and a hazardous part, and the victory is one which is to overcome the vast injury wrought by the serpent in the temptation and fall of man. It is a victory which has in it redemption from evil, as the temptation involved the falling into evil. We have then a blessing to the human race involved in this curse of the serpent: a Messianic promise of redemption to be accomplished, not by the woman, but by her seed. Her seed is the entire race of her descendants. But inasmuch as the serpent is represented as bruising the heel of the man and is distinguished from his seed in the direct address of God to him as "thou," it seems to be necessary to think of the seed of the woman as culminating in an individual man, who will accomplish the final victory over the serpent. We have here, then, the original Messianic prophecy which unfolds in the development of the Messianic idea, until it is realized in Jesus, the Messiah.

The closing pentastich of this strophe gives the punishment of the woman. This consists in sorrow, in connection with child-bearing, and in subjugation to her husband.

#### *IX. The Punishment of the Man.*

And to (the) man (God) said,  
Because thou didst hearken to the voice of thy wife,

And eat of the tree,  
Of which I enjoined thee, saying,  
Thou shalt not eat of it;

Cursed be the ground for thy sake,  
In sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life,  
Thorns and thistles shall it produce for thee,  
And thou shalt eat the herb of the field.

In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread,  
Until thy return unto the ground;  
For out of it thou wast taken,

For dust art thou,  
And unto dust shalt thou return.

This strophe is composed of a nonastich and a pentastich. The nonastich is subdivided into a pentastich and tetrastich. In the first line the Masoretic text has omitted the article with ארם. We restore it in accordance with the usage of this poem. We also insert the subject אלהים before אמר. At the close of the strophe the editor inserts the twentieth verse: "And the man called the name of his wife Eve, for she became the mother of every living person."

This strophe gives the punishment of the man. The first pentastich gives the reason of this punishment; namely, the eating of the forbidden tree as the result of hearkening unto the voice of his wife, instead of obeying the command of God. This is followed by a tetrastich pronouncing a curse upon the ground for man's sake. It was the design of God, according to the first and second strophes, that man should till the ground, and that it should reward him with its fruits. Evil is now introduced into the soil of the earth. It is to produce the herb of the field for the food of man in response to his tillage; but it is also to produce thorns and thistles. To combat them will require hard labor and produce great sorrow. Anxious, ill-requited toil is the punishment of the man. The concluding pentastich goes back upon the penalty of death, which was attached to the transgression. This penalty is now explained as anxious toil, resulting in eventual death. Death is represented

as a returning unto the ground, and a becoming again the dust, out of which God had originally formed him.

*X. The Banishment from Eden.*

And God made for the man and for his wife,  
Tunics of skin and clothed them.  
And God said, Behold the man!  
Has he become like one of us,  
Knowing good and evil?

And now, lest he should put forth his hand,  
And take also of the tree of life,  
And eat and live forever;  
God sent him forth from the garden of Eden  
To till the ground.

And drove out the man,  
And caused to dwell on the east of the garden of Eden  
The cherubim and the revolving flaming sword,  
Guarding the way to the tree of life.

This strophe is composed of a pentastich and a nonastich. In the first line the Masoretic text has omitted the article with אִם. This should be restored. We regard the relative clause: "Whence he had been taken," at the close of the twenty-third verse as a prosaic editorial note.

The pentastich represents that God gives clothing to the guilty pair. The clothing suited to fallen man is not fig leaves and girdles, but the skins of slaughtered animals. We are at once confronted, therefore, with death in the animal kingdom. The animals, which had been formed for the service of man in the garden, now give their life in order to furnish him with appropriate clothing. Death in the animal kingdom teaches man to prepare for his own impending death. The tristich, which closes the first part of this strophe, represents God as speaking to the heavenly intelligences, and calling their attention to the condition of the man. There is a holy irony in the divine words, "Has he become like one of us?" that is, like one of the spiritual intelligences, the cherubim and the holy angels.

The serpent had promised the woman that eating of the tree would open their eyes and make them like God. God had appointed the tree to be a means of teaching them the difference between good and evil. They were learning, under divine guidance, to know good and evil as God and the holy angels know it, by a theoretical and objective knowledge of the evil, and an experimental and internal knowledge of the good. They were constantly growing more like God and the holy spirits, as they advanced in this knowledge. They have now broken away from the guidance of God, and followed the guidance of the evil spirit. "Has he become like one of us?" says God in holy irony to the holy spirits who are round about Him. Nay, man has become like the evil spirit. He has an experimental and internal knowledge of the evil. His knowledge of the good is an external knowledge of that which he himself has lost, but now sees external to himself in God. There is also in this tristich a strain of triumph over the machinations of the evil spirit.

The nonastich gives an account of the banishment of the human pair from the garden of Eden. It is composed of a hexastich and tristich. The hexastich gives an account of the banishment itself, and of the principal reason for it. There were two trees in the garden, which were contrasted in their nature and in their effects, the tree of life and the tree of death. It was not proper that the human pair should partake of both at the same time. He, who had partaken of the tree of death, and incurred the penalty of death, could not be permitted to have access to the tree of life, to eat of it and live forever. Sinful man needed redemption, and redemption required that he should die; and only through death gain everlasting life. Furthermore, man, the sinner, should not be permitted to enjoy the happy tillage of the garden of Eden. He must go forth from the garden and till the ground, which had been cursed, and by thorns and thistles and the sweat of anxious tillage, learn repentance unto salvation.

The closing tristich of the poem presents us with a picture

of the guards of the garden, which prevent human access to it. These are the cherubim, and the revolving flaming sword. The cherubim are exalted spiritual intelligences, who are always associated with the divine throne whenever it appears in theophany. The abiding of the cherubim at the entrance of the garden of Eden involves the abiding of the theophanic presence of God there. The throne of God was erected at the entrance of the garden, whither the banished human pair might ever turn in worship. With the cherubim are associated a revolving sword, probably conceived somewhat after the form of the disc represented as the most potent weapon of the Babylonian deities. It is a fiery flaming blade, because it is wielded in the midst of the blazing glory of the theophany.

Thus the poem of the fall of man presents in ten equal strophes the saddest story in human history.

### III.

#### THE VOCATION OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY:

*Studied in the Light of the Lord's Prayer.*<sup>1</sup>

BY PROFESSOR E. V. GERHART, D.D.

THIS prayer, taught by our Lord, we may meditate upon in two ways. We may first consider the formula agreeably to its *explicit* purpose and character. It is a *prayer*. As a prayer it fulfills a twofold purpose: It is the primary type and model of all true Christian prayers, and it is an office of worship that may be, and ought to be, used by Christians both in the closet and in the sanctuary. These words of Christ may be pronounced an indispensable part of ideal congregational worship.

The Lord's Prayer has also a profound *implicit* significance. Underlying and pervading it there is a distinctive theology and a distinctive philosophy. Both are eminently practical. Its philosophical theology is the foundation both of an effective gospel ministry and of a truly Christian life of practical godliness. Under this second aspect I propose at present to consider the liturgical office dictated by Jesus Christ.

The Lord's Prayer contains positive ideas which are an answer to the metaphysical questions put by philosophy in all ages.

There is here a doctrine concerning God and man; concerning the kingdom of God and the relation which He sustains to it; also a doctrine concerning the antagonism between Christ and Satan, between light and darkness, good and evil. Besides,

<sup>1</sup> Originally an unwritten discourse preached before the students of the Theological Seminary, Lancaster, April 27, 1884, now, in response to special requests, written out (on the basis of notes taken by a student at the time) and committed to the press.



there is taught in this prayer a truth which supplies the principal need of ministers, in order that they may take a firm stand and do effective work against the powers of sin.

Let us, therefore, endeavor to look at the inner pavillion of Christian truth, in other words, *present the vocation and character of a minister of the gospel as implicitly taught* by the wonderful organism of words called the Lord's Prayer. In discussing the general theme *three* points will demand consideration :

1. The positive work of a Christian minister as by implication set forth in the first part of the Prayer ;
2. The dependence and sufficiency of a minister in the conflict with the kingdom of darkness ;
3. The order in which these two things—the positive work and the conflict with evil—are related to one another.

#### I.

The positive work binding the conscience of a minister of the gospel is rooted in the direct relation which God, our Father, bears in Jesus Christ, to us, His servants.

The prayer begins : Our Father, who art in heaven. God is in heaven ; we are on the earth. Earth and heaven are different and opposite realms. The difference is not local nor temporal. It does not prevail according to the laws either of time or of space. Opposition and difference exist as to quality and kind. The truth of heaven is given in and with the idea of God ; the truth of earth is given in and with the idea of man. As man differs from God, and the creature from the Creator, so does the earthly differ from the heavenly. As between God and man, between the eternal and the temporal, there is a deep, broad gulf, so there is a deep, broad gulf between heaven and earth, between the heavenly existence and the earthly existence. It is necessary and important clearly and firmly to maintain the distinction and the difference between these two realms.

It is said : God is everywhere. The proposition is valid. I do not question it. But it may with equal propriety be said : God is nowhere. He has no location on earth, no defined position in

the universe like the position or location predicable of man. Using words in a sense properly applicable to man, we must declare, agreeably to the philosophy of the Lord's Prayer, that God is nowhere on the earth. Instead, He is in heaven. God bears a relation immediately to Himself, eternally above and independent of the earth and all creatures, a relation generically different from that which He bears to all objects not Himself. Heaven is the glorious abode, the absolute communion of God, the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, with Himself, unchangeably blessed, as the triune God Himself is unchangeably love.

The personal creature, man, bears a relation to himself which is peculiar to manhood, distinguishing man from God, and man from every other creature. His temporary finite abode is the earth, an abode which is blessed or miserable, according as man's moral and spiritual position and activity are true or false.

Human philosophy is prone either to separate or to identify these two distinct realms, God and man, heaven and earth. If separated, the opposite terms, man and God, the earthly and the heavenly, remain, but there is no communion between them. Each stands apart from the other. God has no sympathy with temporal or finite affairs, and man has no direct interest in the divine life of blessedness in heaven. If identified, the difference between earth and heaven vanishes; but then the reality of the terms themselves is dissolved into nothing. Heaven is abolished; and earth is a dismantled ship at sea without a pilot or rudder, without cargo or haven.

Christ, on the contrary, affirms the reality of heaven and of earth, and their essential difference; but with no less certainty also affirms sympathy and communion, in Himself, between God and man, between God's infinite abode and man's finite abode. However deep the gulf of difference, in Him there is a direct relationship between these opposite realms. He is the unity of essential godhead and essential manhood. In Him, therefore, Heaven and earth meet; the infinite life and the finite life, the eternal realm and the temporal realm, are internally conjoined;

and we address God: *Our Father*. Though God is in heaven and we on the earth, He infinite and we finite, yet, notwithstanding the deep, broad gulf between the Creator and creature, between His holiness and our unholiness, there is an immediate fellowship between Him, the Father, and us, His children. In Christ this relation is on the one side parental, and on the other filial. He and the members of His kingdom are one household of love. The Father loves us with an infinite love; though finite, we are capable of receiving and enjoying His love. In turn, we, His children, love Him with a finite love; and though infinite, He rejoices in our filial fellowship. In Christ this fellowship is real, vital, direct. No authority, no organization, intervenes, in an external way, between the Father in heaven and His adopted children on earth.

In this direct filial relationship the true minister of the Gospel stands, representing the authority, the truth, and grace of God in His kingdom; his solemn vocation being to hallow the Name of His Father in heaven.

The *Name* of the Father is the Father Himself as He goes forth in different modes of manifestation. By the Son His eternal idea of the cosmos has been realized in a first creation, the universal whole of things, culminating in man, the crown of creation, and bearing God's own image. All original laws and normal relations declare His immanent will; all kingdoms reaching their unity in man proclaim His wisdom. The wisdom and goodness, the power and authority, the organization and design, discernible in the natural world, manifest, according to its measure of capacity, the hidden nature of the Father. Pre-eminently, however, is the new creation in Jesus Christ the self-manifestation of the Father. The personal life of the God-man on earth, His transcendent history on His mediatorial throne, and His impending Second Advent lead forth the fatherhood of God into the light of day. He who beholds the life of the incarnate Son beholds the life of the eternal Father. I may even say that the Name of the Father is Jesus Christ. Not that the Father and the Son are identical; but that the

Son is the perfect image of the Father. God, as absolute spirit; spirit as uncreated life, original light, unchangeable love,—lives, speaks, ministers to human misery in the person of the Son of man. The word *Christ* accordingly expresses the wholeness of the Father's heart.

The Name of the Father it is the vocation of the minister to hallow. The first petition of this great prayer represents the chief end of the ministry; reveals the inmost desire and purpose of a faithful minister. In general the Name of the Father is to be hallowed by two methods.

The one is negative. God is the absolute Good. Like Himself, all His activity is good. As in heaven He lives the life of love, so in all His relations to men, He deals with them according to the wisdom and righteousness of love. To Him and to all His works evil is antagonistic. He turns with infinite aversion against the wrong, the inhuman; against all forms of immorality and vice. Negatively, you hallow His Name when you dissociate from Him the evil, the impure, the unlovely. In the degree in which a minister, by word and deed, in the pulpit and at the altar, casts out as evil that which is evil, and by manner and conduct reveals uncompromising antipathy to all forms of the impurity of sin, he so far forth declares the sanctity of the Father.

The other way of hallowing the Name of the Father is positive. This is the leading aim of the institution of the ministry. Being in Himself the noblest good, the original and unchangeable perfection of the right, ministers are called and ordained to this sublime end: in words to declare God to be for Himself the all-sufficient good, also the only satisfying good for all men; but especially in their life and conduct, in their deeds and ministrations, to embody and illustrate the supreme Good, that thus both personally and officially they may be the living manifestation of the positive righteousness of the Father. Devoted to the right for its own sake, and governed by the law of love revealed in the personal history of Jesus Christ, you in every position which you may occupy, and in all your relations

as men, citizens, and the ambassadors of Christ, by your self-consecration to things good, pure and of good report, are to sanctify the holy Name. The Church sees the divine life of holiness in your hearty devotion to truth and goodness. The Church comes under the sanctifying power of the Holy Name by the spirituality, the conscientiousness and sanctity of the lives which you live. Then you and your people fulfil, according to the measure of the grace appropriated by each, the prayer: Hallowed be thy name.

Further, in the degree that the Father's Name is sanctified by the sound words and the righteous lives of ministers and people, the outside world learns the great truth that the sanctity of the Father is the wisdom and holiness of the immeasurable love manifest in our Lord Jesus Christ.

The hallowing of the Father's name implies the existence of a holy realm, in which the Father reigns. The kingdom of the Father is a new kingdom, and stands opposed to the kingdom of moral evil. The apostasy of the first man has produced a dark realm on earth, in which sin works and rules. The fidelity and sinless perfection of the Second Man, or His life of pure devotion to His Father's will, has founded the kingdom of God, the realm of purity and holiness. Here, by the life and redemptive work of the Son, the Name of the Father reigns through the regenerating and sanctifying agency of the Spirit.

Into the kingdom of the Father we have been baptized. In it we are nourished by its own food and drink. By the authority of this kingdom you are, through ordination, to be invested with the right to minister at its altars and to proclaim its new doctrines and new commandments. From its wisdom you receive light; by its strength you are to be strong; by subjection to its law you are personally righteous, and you become purer and holier day by day; and by the anointing continually imparted to you through the Spirit of the Father in this new spiritual realm, you may be faithful in the service of holiness to the end of your days, even increasing in self-denying devotion as the circling seasons of future years come and go.

Standing in the kingdom, and living by its heavenly life, you hallow the Name of the Father in the degree that you are efficient organs of the coming of the kingdom. The kingdom has come, established on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner-stone. The kingdom is now in process of coming. It is asserting deeper force, and more extensive sanctifying influence upon the nations. And the kingdom will continue to come until its history of regeneration and sanctification shall be consummated.

The Name is hallowed in the degree that the Father's kingdom subdues to the authority of Christ the nations of the earth and the hearts of individuals. Ministers fulfill their vocation by enriching themselves from the heavenly resources of this kingdom. In the world there are for them no positive resources. In the service of the world there is for them no work to do. The best service they can render the nations of the earth is to subdue the nations to the authority, and enrich them with the divine wealth of this kingdom.

As ministers promote the growth of the kingdom, subduing men to the obedience of the gospel, and enriching them with its unspeakable treasures, they make holy and glorious the Name of the Father, thus fulfilling the end of their great commission. That the name of the Father be hallowed by the coming of the kingdom is His will. Of the Father's authority there is a two-fold fundamental expression: Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Of this two-fold authority the kingdom is the true realization and the fulfillment. Christ, the founder of the kingdom, revealed the whole truth of the twofold law, and revealed it not so much by words as by a perfect illustration of it in His personal history. He fulfilled the Father's will on earth; He is now perfectly fulfilling that will in Heaven.

It has been said that in heaven the Father's will is done by the angels, and the perfection of angelic obedience is the standard of obedience for the members of the kingdom on earth. Doubtless it is true that holy angels do the Father's will per-

fectly, according to the measure of their finite capacities. But I question the adequacy of this interpretation. Not the obedience of the angels, but the fulfillment of the Father's will by the Son of Man is in Scripture set before us as the ideal of the holy service of Christian love.

The will of the Father was eternally done by the reciprocal communion of absolute love between the Son and the Father in the ineffable glory of the Godhead. That love is brought to light when the Son comes into the world to reveal God and redeem our fallen race. Living in the God-form of existence in heaven, He passed from the infinite realm to our finite abode, taking upon him the man-form of existence on earth. Found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself under the condemnation of the law by man broken, and became obedient unto death, to the end that in Himself He might destroy sin and perfect man in a new communion of divine love. This deed of love was, this is, the Father's will; the will done, not by angels, but done alone by the Son incarnate. Accordingly, our Lord says: A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. Again: This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you. He translates the old command into a new command. True self-love is not the sufficient measure of fraternal love; that measure is His own love to men, fulfilled by laying down His life for their redemption. This new deed of love is the doing of the Father's will; the complement of it is the perfection of obedience at the right hand of the Father, where He ever liveth, carrying forward, in behalf of fallen men, the work of regenerating and saving love.

Christ revealing the Father's heart in His self-humiliation, Christ now fulfilling the work of redemptive love in Heaven, is for us all, especially for a minister of the Gospel, the true illustration of obedience to the Father's will. As Christ did that will in the flesh, as He is doing that will in His state of glorification, so are you to do the Father's will in the work of the holy ministry. There is for you no law, no example, other than the

unique life of our Lord Jesus Christ. No angel, no archangel, is the criterion of the spirit that is to animate and characterize the faithful minister of the glorious Gospel.

If it be your sole aim to do the will of the Father as Jesus has fulfilled, and is now fulfilling that will, the kingdom of the Father will come with power, and extend its dominion, through your ministrations. And as you labor to advance the kingdom by fulfilling the will of divine love agreeably to the pattern of Christ's obedience, you will accomplish the great end of your ministry; you will hallow the Name of our Father who is in Heaven.

## II.

Who is sufficient for these things? Paul replies: I can do all things in Him that strengtheneth me. To fulfill the work of the ministry according to the standard set by Christ is a great and difficult work, demanding spiritual strength and bodily support. The resources adequate to the performance of its manifold duties no one can find either in himself or in his fellow-men. He who imposes the obligation, is also the One who nourishes your spiritual vitality, and ministers to the needs of soul and body.

Says our Lord: Give us this day our daily bread. The minister needs heavenly food. He also needs earthly food. For he is correlated to two worlds. Christ recognizes your human relations as really as your divine relations. All the exigencies arising from this twofold attitude are met by your Father in Heaven.

The supply of your temporal and spiritual necessities is the fruit of the faithful performance of your ministerial work. The location of the petition for *bread* in the structure of the Lord's Prayer is not accidental. It forms a transition from its positive to its negative hemisphere; and is analogous to the position occupied by the command to honor father and mother in the structure of the Decalogue.

When we do the will of the Father after the pattern given by our Lord we promote the growth of the kingdom; by promoting



the growth of the kingdom we hallow the name of the Father; and when we hallow the Father's name, we receive a two-fold benefit: Heavenly nourishment, and better personal fitness for performing greater services and obtaining greater blessings. Heavenly manna descends from the Father to those who with a true heart labor for the coming of His kingdom.

From the same source and according to the same law comes the needful supply of your bodily wants. You require food and drink, raiment and shelter, books, home and friends. But these gifts are not bestowed by means of a secular vocation, nor by cherishing a secular spirit. "Even so did the Lord ordain that they who proclaim the Gospel should live of the Gospel." The kingdom of Heaven is on earth. It reigns in the hearts of believers; it exerts an elevating influence on the life and conduct of unbelievers; and it appropriates to its service the laws and forces of external nature. When you consecrate your time and strength to the kingdom, subordinating all social relations and all earthly ends to the coming of the kingdom, you will experience the fulfillment of those enigmatic words of our Lord: "Seek ye first His kingdom and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you." Your spiritual nourishment will be rich in the degree in which you seek, first and always, the kingdom of the Father. In that degree also you will be lifted above the world, and become independent of the ordinary secular conditions of a livelihood.

I have said that the petition for *daily bread* occupies a two-fold position, being intermediate between the positive life and the negative attitude of Christian people and of the Christian ministry. The spiritual strength and earthly support derived from fidelity to the kingdom, conditions your ability firmly to maintain the conflict with the powers of darkness.

The kingdom of heaven erected in the midst of this fallen world, is a declaration of hostility to sin, proclaiming a deadly and persistent war against Satan and his mighty empire. That empire assails the ministry in two ways: from within and from without.

Moral evil is a perverting force active in your own hearts, and shows itself in manifold shortcomings. Moral evil also is a vitiating force in the complex social organism of which you are members. From without, sometimes with greater and sometimes with less force, it is a temptation, a trial of your fidelity to the kingdom, or a direct solicitation to wrongdoing and to the exercise of an erroneous judgment. You are exposed to numberless external dangers.

From within evil works like a subtle poison. Relatively to the kingdom of the Father it weakens faith, obscures spiritual perception, and produces obtuseness and sluggishness of soul. Ministers fail of the perfect fulfillment of their obligations to Jesus Christ. Relatively to the empire of Satan, the plastic force of evil within strengthens the false action of the natural appetites, secretly bidding welcome to the approaches of Satan and the allurements of the world.

Moral evil is active from within and from without at the same time. Ministers and laity alike are liable to become the victims of a conspiracy. The flesh, the world and the devil are one in the work of defeating the great ends of the kingdom of the Father; they combine to neutralize or destroy the effectiveness of the ministry. The issues between good and evil, between right and wrong, between the officebearers of the kingdom and the empire of Satan, are inevitable and perpetual. The calling of the minister imposes the obligation to carry on a *constant* spiritual warfare.

How shall the minister make a firm stand? What shall he do to achieve the victory? How may he be faithful to his great trust in the kingdom of heaven?

The true answer is found in the unexpressed wisdom of the Lord's Prayer. Beholding the world of moral evil by which believers are encompassed; knowing the numerous shortcomings of his people, and the severe moral ordeal through which every layman, every minister, is passing; and emphasizing the war which the Evil One is ever waging against the kingdom of heaven; Christ fixes confidence and hope, not on antagonism to

sin and Satan, but on consecration to the Father and the Father's kingdom. The eye of the soul he does not turn in upon itself. Sin is not to be destroyed by the contemplation of sin. Temptation is not to be overcome by intensifying the consciousness of temptation. No one achieves a victory over Satan by the study of Satan's wiles, or by an analysis of the complex forces active in his empire.

Instead, the wisdom of Christ introduces a different method; turning our eyes from the evil to the good, from the empire of Satan to the kingdom of heaven. Wisdom and strength must come from above, not from ourselves, not from the experiences of temptation, not from a negative resistance of Satan. Ability to resist evil is developed by doing the right, to stand firm against temptation by positive activity in the service of the kingdom.

Here we are touching the question concerning the order in which the positive and negative phases of the work of the ministry is to be pursued.

### III.

The organization of the Lord's Prayer implies the two-fold general vocation of laymen and of ministers, namely, to do the good and shun the evil, to promote righteousness and put down sin, to serve God and resist the devil. The kingdom of light is, in the present perverted condition of our race, at every step of its progress opposed by the kingdom of darkness. The former does not accomplish its positive end except in as far as it weakens, eliminates and conquers the latter.

What relation do these two aspects of one calling bear to another? To this question two answers may be given.

The one proposes a negative method. This looks first and prevaillingly at moral evil, analyzes it, strives to beat down its agencies, and to deliver the victims of sin from its dominion, in order to make room for the coming of the kingdom of God.

The other proposes a positive method. It fixes attention and reposes confidence mainly on the truth, the goodness, the love,

and wisdom at hand in the kingdom of God, in order to advance the kingdom by teaching, asserting, developing and fulfilling the elements of its own life, and thus effectually to rescue the world from the falsehoods and miseries of sin.

The Lord's Prayer moves on the principle of the latter or positive method. It passes from heaven to earth, from God to man, from the hallowing of the Father's name to the forgiveness of sin, from the coming of the kingdom to the resistance of temptation, from the doing of the will of the Father to deliverance from the Evil One. The philosophy of Jesus Christ latent in this office of worship furnishes the answer to the question as to which of these two methods is dictated by the genius of the Gospel.

There is only one effectual way by which you may labor successfully in the service of the kingdom; that is, by living the positive righteousness and proclaiming the positive truth of the Gospel. The might of Christian truth is in the Christian truth; the virtue of righteousness is in righteousness. There is no means for putting down moral evil, but by affirming the good in word and in deed; no way of ceasing to do wrong but by doing the right. Evil has no resources but in the service of evil; wrong has no power but to multiply wrong. Need it be said that sin is no part of the Gospel? That the Gospel can derive no aid and support from the denunciation of sin, nor from the analysis of human depravity? That the ways of malice and wickedness are in no sense means for the coming of the kingdom?

Some ministers make a great mistake when they imagine that there is evangelical gain in directly fighting with the kingdom of darkness; that they may diminish evil by portraying evil, or weaken sin by exposing sin. In such an attitude of opposition there is indeed a measure of propriety; for correct views of moral evil are important, and a true Christian life is unquestionably at all points contrary to every degree and kind of moral evil. I neither overlook, nor ignore, the fact that the Gospel and the work of the ministry are closely

related to the dark side of human nature. But the darkness of sin cannot be dissipated by putting emphasis upon it. The fulcrum of gospel leverage is not sin but righteousness; not denunciation of wrong but love; not resistance to the kingdom of darkness, but the affirmation of the kingdom of light. The difference is one of emphasis and of relation.

The positive and the negative, or the affirmation of the right and the exposure of the wrong, both necessarily enter into the true evangelical method of ministerial labor; but the structure of the Lord's Prayer teaches that the strength, the effectiveness and joy of the ministry depend on the positive method of teaching and of ministration. All your resources are in the kingdom of the Father. You will be firm, spiritually rich, and mighty in the pulpit, as you aim steadily at hallowing His name by doing His will. For the Gospel is primarily divine truth and righteousness, faith in Christ, love to God and man, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.

Occupying this evangelical attitude you will labor with confidence and hope, whatever the opposition by which you are beset, or however powerful, apparently, the evils and vices of society which resist your aims. Here is found the secret of true spiritual courage. Do not look to the fruits of your labor for confidence. The best encouragement is not to be derived from your success; but the best success depends on evangelical courage. Courage and confidence have no uncertain source. That is ever the same, whether the sky be clear or lowering, whether the enemies of the Gospel be many or few, whether sinners become obedient to the faith by thousands or only by scores.

The kingdom has an immovable foundation. Confide in it alone, and you will share its immovableness. The kingdom is the living fullness of heavenly powers, adequate to all emergencies, theological and practical, in the future history of your ministry. You can be as mighty for good as is the kingdom, in the measure that you confide solely in its life-powers, and by faith and prayer make them your own.

But if you depend for strength on your acquirements, or

deem it your principal calling to do battle against sin, or draw your encouragement from your success in achieving victories over Satan, you will be comparatively weak, you will have but little joy, and be harassed by much false concern. You will measurably fall short of the great end to accomplish which you are called to be the ambassadors of Jesus Christ.

I most earnestly counsel you to turn away from this unscriptural method. Attempt no reversal of the wisdom of the Lord's prayer. Do not in your ministrations try to pass from man to God, from darkness to light, from hatred to love, from Satan to Christ. Let it not be your chief purpose to portray vice, to analyze the deceitfulness of the depraved heart, to expose evil and denounce sin. Put your trust unconditionally in the *omnipotent Truth* of the Gospel. Christ has broken the dominion of sin, destroyed death, conquered hell. This victory is for you, the firm vantage ground. Plant your feet upon it. Take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand. That armor is the girdle of truth, the breastplate of righteousness, the gospel of peace, the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, the Word of God, prayer and supplication in the Spirit. Thus arrayed, you will be able to stand against the wiles of the devil, quench all his fiery darts, watch with all perseverance; and utterance will be given unto you that you may open your mouth boldly to make known the mystery of the Gospel. Then you may be fearless, when others are fearful; your courage may rise, when wickedness becomes defiant; your soul may be hopeful and joyous amidst great perplexities; and you will win many men to Christ, even from the ranks of His bitter foes.

## IV.

### THE WILL.

BY REV. C. R. LANE, PH. D.

THE problem of the will is one that has engaged attention, as long as history has preserved any record of discussion with regard to the nature and operations of the human mind; and it is no nearer a satisfactory solution now than it was at the earliest known consideration of it. This fact is enough to prove that the subject is one of great difficulty, either in itself, or its surroundings, or in both.

This subject, which is so difficult as mere matter of Metaphysics in regard to the truth of things, is also one of exceedingly great importance in view of its relation to moral philosophy, because it concerns the very ground of our accountability, and to the interpretation of the Scriptures, because no sane man can believe that the Scriptures teach what he believes to be contrary to the very constitution of his nature. In view, therefore, of these relations, as well as the fact itself, it is not wonderful that all questions pertaining to the will have been discussed with so much care and zeal and thoroughness, and as far as the resources of the human mind in its present condition are concerned, exhaustively. For the discussion has had all the advantages that arise, not only from that natural curiosity which desires to know what is true in fact, and from that perverseness, born of partisan zeal, which desires to maintain and defend opinions once adopted and proclaimed, but also from the regard men have to right and duty as such and as related to their own best interests both in this life and that which is to come. Every imaginable advantage, therefore, that any subject can have, this subject has had in the length of the debate and

the stimulus it supplies to the debaters. It cannot be expected, therefore, that anything new can now be offered. All that can be even hoped for is a clear and fair presentation of a subject, which, in view of its acknowledged difficulty, requires the most careful consideration, and in view of its far-reaching consequences, whatever solution is adopted as correct, challenges the most earnest attention of each succeeding generation.

### I.

In regard to a subject at once so difficult and so important, it is proper to attempt, at least, to clear it as far as possible from ambiguity, not with the hope of doing what has never yet been done, viz., to present the subject so that it cannot be misunderstood, but in such a way that those who really desire to know what is intended will be at no loss to find out what is meant.

In order to this, the first thing to be done is to separate the two entirely different, yet equally well authorized meanings of the word will: namely, on the one hand, as including the affections and desires, as the word is used when the mental faculties are classified, as understanding and will; and on the other, as a faculty or power of the mind distinct from the affections and desires, as it means when the mental faculties are classified as understanding, affections and will. For what is true when the word is taken in one of these two meanings is false when it is taken in the other. In this paper, the word is taken in the latter sense, namely, as a faculty of the mind distinct from the affections and desires.

When the word will is taken in this sense, the all-important and the only important question is, Why are the volitions, that is, the acts of the will, this way rather than that?

To this question two, and only two, radically different answers are given, founded on two radically different theories and leading to radically different results. One of these answers is that the volition is the way it is rather than some other way on account of the state of mind produced by the motives presented, viewed as reasons; and the other answer is the



volition is a sovereign act of the will, independent of the understanding, as convinced or unconvinced, of the affections, as drawn to or repelled from it, or of the conscience as to the right or wrong of it; independent of any influence motives of any kind can exert as reasons and of any state of mind they can produce. For, if any of these things in any way exert any influence, then the volition is not sovereign, that is to say, it is not a free act of the will, but it depends for its existence as it is on something external to the will, as its cause. The theory on which the first answer is given is known in the history of the discussion as that of rational spontaneity, *Lubentia rationalis*; and the other as the theory of the self-determining power of the will, viewed as a distinct faculty of the mind and acting independent of motives, as opposed to the self-determining power of the agent acting in view of motives regarded as sufficient reasons to determine volitions this way rather than that or insufficient.

Inasmuch as all that has been said is important only as it leads up to this statement of the issue, and as all that is to follow is of account only as it bears upon the correctness or the incorrectness of the one theory or the other, it will not be amiss to restate each of the theories as a whole, both directly and by way of contrast.

The one theory assumes that the rational agent, not his will, is self-determining, and that his volitions in any particular case are determined this way rather than that by the motives as he views them, namely, as reasons valid or invalid; and, consequently, when the nature of the agent is given and the motives, then the view he takes of them is also given, that is, the volition itself is given. For this reason this theory, called that of rational spontaneity, as to its nature, is also called the theory of moral certainty, as to its results. Moral, because the nature of the connection on which the certainty depends is wholly different from that which exists between material things, yet certain, because the rational agent must act according to his rational nature, that is, in view of reasons which seem good to himself in the circumstances in which he is placed.

The other theory is that the will, not the rational agent, but the will itself, as a faculty of the mind, is a sovereign, that is, the will is free from, because it is superior to any and every influence external to itself, independent, on the one hand, of the understanding and the affections; and on the other, of any subjective state of the mind and also of the particular circumstances in which it is called to act. Very properly, therefore, this theory, in regard to the view it takes of motives and their influence, is called the theory of indifference: and, in view of the consequences which flow from it, the theory of contingency, for volitions dissevered by the sovereignty of the will, both from the nature of the agent and from the influence of motives, are, by the reason of the thing, as well as by the final cause of the theory, uncertain—unknown and unknowable, even to Omniscience, until they are actually made. For what is knowable is known to Omniscience, and if they are known, they are no longer contingent as to their existence, but certain.

Such are the two theories, which their respective advocates and opponents have been attacking and defending from the beginning. In this work they are still engaged as actively and as zealously as ever, and as fruitlessly, as far as any well-grounded hope of agreement is concerned. For the very things which the advocates of the one theory consider as arguments in its favor, the advocates of the other view, as grave, if not insuperable, objections: and yet, between these two theories, each consistent with itself, but totally irreconcilable with the other, and having indeed nothing in common, except the admission that volitions do in fact exist:—between these two theories so diametrically opposed to each other, both in their nature and consequences, we must choose. For the ingenuity of men, stimulated by natural curiosity, by partisan zeal, by the love of truth and regard for duty and by their reverence for the Word of God, has been unable to present any other theory, either between these two or outside of them, which has commanded the continued assent of any considerable body of followers. All that remains, therefore, to be done, is for the

advocates of each to maintain their own views by such arguments as seem satisfactory to themselves, and to meet as best they can the arguments of their opponents.

## II.

In regard to any metaphysical subject, the appeal is,

First. To consciousness, and in regard to this subject, it may be affirmed, 1st, that the rational agent is not conscious of anything within him acting independently of himself; but he is conscious that it is he, himself, who exercises volitions directly according to the information he has, the desires of his nature and the obligation of what he feels to be right. Between these feelings and desires on the one hand and himself on the other, there is nothing made known by consciousness as acting independent of the state of mind these things produce and competent to overrule it.

2d. The power to make volitions is itself a property of the agent, and, therefore, as a property, it cannot be free in the sense that it is independent of the agent; but it is related to him in the same way all the other properties are. For we can no more conceive of the will as free to will as it wills, regardless of the effect produced on the mind of the rational agent by the influences which are operating on it, than we can conceive of the freedom of the understanding to reject the truth of an axiom, or of the affections to take delight in what is repulsive to them, or of the conscience to approve of what it feels to be wrong. It is not, therefore, the will or any other faculty that is free, but the agent in the use of his faculties. It is not the will that decides for the agent, but the agent, in the use of his faculties. On any other view, the will, which as the power of volition is only one element in personality, is itself a person, to the exclusion of intelligence, which is as necessary to personality as volition.

Secondly. All the acts of a rational agent can be classified as spontaneous and deliberate.

As to those acts which are spontaneous, whether instinctive

or intuitive, they are the direct and immediate outcome of a rational nature, and as such they are intelligent, the result neither of mere animal impulse nor of reflection or reasoning. They are as they are in virtue of the nature of their subject, noble or ignoble, good or bad according to the nature in which they have their origin; and they show most clearly what that nature is, because they are voluntary in the sense that they are in accordance with the will taken in the large sense, that is, as including the affections and desires; but they are not voluntary in the sense that they are the result of reflection or any conscious process of reasoning. These acts, therefore, by the statement of the question are excluded from the present discussion.

On the other hand, all deliberate acts are rational, not simply as of a rational nature, but also because they are done for a specific reason and have that reason as the ground of their existence, the way they are rather than some other way. This reason for doing or not doing, or for doing this way rather than some other way, may be good or bad in itself and in the view of others, but it is both valid and sufficient in the view of the actor.

For 1st, all such acts imply in the first instance doubt as to what is right or wise to be done; and this doubt leads to an investigation of the facts in the case and to a consideration of their importance and bearing as reasons on the one side and on the other. Of this consideration comes the decision. In the view of two different agents contemplating the same facts and reasons, the conclusions may be the same or different, but the view taken by each is to him the ground, reason or motive for the act; and for him to decide differently would be an act of self-stultification. A volition, therefore, is a rational act, not one done with an absurd disregard of the facts made known by investigation, or with an insane disregard of consequences, but done for a reason considered as sufficient and in order to an end deemed desirable, the act of an agent in the use of all his faculties, and not the act of one faculty acting independently of and contrary to the other faculties and to himself.

When the mental faculties are compared among themselves in their relations to deliberate acts, it is the province of the perceptive faculties to apprehend the facts, of the understanding to consider their importance, of the affections to judge of any of the courses that seem open, as desirable or undesirable, and of the conscience to decide as to their moral quality. When all this has been done, then and not before, the will, up to this time held in abeyance, is called into exercise, not as the master of the other faculties, but as their servant, not to will as it wills, but to choose in accordance with what the other faculties view as true or desirable or good. In all deliberate acts, therefore, the will is not superior to the other mental faculties, but dependent on them; for otherwise deliberation would be the most foolish of all follies, laborious in its processes and yet fruitless in its results, always toilsome, often perplexing and never useful to the end for which it is professedly made. For it can be useful only as far as it is influential; but if it is influential to secure a volition this way or that as the result, then the volition is not a sovereign act, which is contrary to the theory of the will's self-determining power.

Thirdly. In line with the theory of rational spontaneity in relation to deliberate acts is found a very ancient and widespread practice, namely, that of using argument and persuasion to induce men to do certain things, or to leave them undone. But if the will, in order to its legitimate exercise, must be indifferent, then the more conclusive the argument and the stronger the reasons, that is, the more they are in accord with or opposed to the nature of the agent and suited or otherwise to the circumstances in which he is placed, the further is the will from the exercise of volition. For if the will must be indifferent, it must postpone action until everything external to itself has ceased to operate as an influence; that is, argument and persuasion are worse than labor lost. For, on the other hand, they have no tendency to secure action one way rather than another; and, on the other hand,

they are by the theory an effectual cause of delaying action until the equilibrium of indifference is restored. But this result, logically true by theory, is certainly contrary to the common judgment of men as made known by their conduct, and persisted in so long and so commonly as to suggest intuition rather than reasoning and experience as the ground of their convictions that argument and persuasion are of use for the reason that they tend as causes to produce the volition which those who use them desire to secure as an effect.

At this point comes up the objection to the self-determining power of the agent, that by it, as the theory of moral certainty, the volitions become a series of causes and effects, and therefore that they are not free but necessary.

The force of this objection, as far as the objection has any force, lies in the ambiguity of the words, "free" and "necessary." For if the meaning be that the volitions must be free in the sense of independent of any reason for its existence either in the nature of the agent or in the motive, then the answer is, in the first place, that we are conscious of no such act of the mind, and in the next, if we were, it would certainly not be a deliberate nor in any sense a rational act, but one of mere animal instinct, of which freedom can be neither affirmed or denied. But if by a free volition it is meant that the volition made is the one which, all things considered, is deemed more desirable than any other, then the force of the objection fails; for it is necessary not as inevitable, that is, determined by something external to the agent, but by the agent himself acting according to his nature, and such necessity is the highest possible form of freedom, the only kind made known to us by consciousness or conceivable by us, namely, choice on the ground of preference; and it is to this very end, that is, to secure volitions in accordance with worthy motives, that parents and teachers direct their most vigorous and persistent efforts that the young may be influenced and determined in their volitions by what is honorable and good, and that by this means they may be guarded against foolish and evil volitions, and

strengthened in regard to those that are wise and good. Therefore,

Thirdly, The theory of rational spontaneity, as the theory of moral certainty, depending on the agent's preference of one thing to another, is, and that of contingency, founded on indifference to motives, is not consistent with the formation of character, good or bad. For, whatever may be the nature of the agent as wise or foolish, good or bad, his volitions are and they must be totally separated both from his nature and surroundings, and therefore also from each other. There is, therefore, in any act of the will nothing to make another act of the same kind more or less probable in the same or similar circumstances, or to make the nature of the agent stronger or weaker in one direction than in any other. For every act is a contingency in the sense that it is separate from everything else, whether nature, habit or specific motive, uninfluenced by anything done in the past and exerting no influence on anything to be done or left undone in the future; and yet within the sphere of human knowledge there are few things more certain than that all mental acts often repeated do result in mental habits, those permanent, immanent dispositions, which, as an observed fact, render a volition of one kind in any given case more probable than one of any other kind. What the agent is leads him to do what he does, and what he does confirms him in what he is; so that in the same or similar circumstances his acts are more likely to be the same way than any other; and on the other hand, by his acts, he is forming a character more and more stable, which in its turn leads to a course of conduct more and more uniform, for the reason that there is between his volitions and himself, and therefore also between his separate volitions, a real, rational and intimate connection. This connection forms what in a modified sense may be called a series, because no man, owing to his own imperfection and the consequent conflict which external motives often excite in his mind, is always consistent with himself in regard to the wisdom or folly, the right or the wrong of his volitions. But while this series,

so-called, is not rigidly uniform, it is not a neutral series; for the agent is continually becoming better and better, or worse and worse, by what he does, and therefore his volitions are always tending more and more in the same direction, whether good or bad; and yet in all this, there is nothing mechanical, but the very reverse, because every volition is a distinct and rational act of choice; and this suggests,

Fourthly, the last objection that will be considered to the self-determining power of the agent, namely, its relation to chance and fate.

1. For by the theory, there is no connection between the nature of the agent and the motive contemplated by him, on the one hand; and the volition, on the other, and therefore, in the reason of the thing as well as by the theory itself, the volition is contingent in the sense that it is uncertain, not merely as to our knowledge of what it will be, but uncertain in itself as causeless, until it is actually made. What it will be, therefore, is simply and only a matter of chance. For as the result of nothing going before, it is likely or as unlikely to be in any specified way as any other way; for the will, the only source and author of the volition must be equally indifferent to all possible ways. This conclusion, it must be remembered, is not merely a logical deduction from the theory, but it is the very final cause of the theory, namely, uncertainty as to the volition following from the indifference of the will to any volition, that is, uncertainty as to what the volition will be, is the only thing certain until the chance among all possible ways has been decided by the event.

2. There is, however, one aspect in which the will is not sovereign even in the supposition of its self-determining power; that is, it has no power over its own activity. For by its nature as a faculty and by the final cause of its existence, it must go on making volitions unceasingly; and these volitions necessary as to their existence as such, are determined by a power that is efficient as against anything and everything external to itself. The will ceases to be the faculty of



choosing, for choice implies both a supposed difference in the object and consequently a preference in the subject, and it becomes the mere power to make volitions, untrammelled by anything that can be brought to bear upon it as the means of securing any proposed end; and this is fate. For such freedom of will is the slavery of the intelligent subject to a blind (blind, for the light of knowledge is excluded,) and tyrannical (tyrannical, for the volition has no rational ground for its existence),—the intelligent subject is in slavery to a blind, tyrannical force acting regardless of the past and tending to no object in the future, inexorable to desire, and unaffected by the use of means; and thus it introduces a fatal necessity into the operation of the will, and it does this against the person, the intelligent agent, to whom the will as a faculty belongs.

From these objections, on the other hand, the theory of the self-determining power of the agent is free. For the volition, in any particular case, is not by fate, because the result is secured by motives as means to an end. It is not, therefore, something submitted to as inevitable, but it is preferred, and therefore chosen as wisest and best; nor is it of chance, but morally certain, because it is determined by the view which the agent takes of the reasons for deciding one way rather than another. For any other choice than the one actually made would involve the contradiction that a rational being chooses what in fact he does not choose.

3. It has not escaped the common sense of mankind that chance and fate, the poles apart in some respects, are yet in other respects only different views of the same thing. For the original conception of fate is that which is determined by casting lots, (*Μείρομαι*) that is, by Chance; whence it is that the words, *Μοῖρα*, *Κλήροσ*, *Τύχη* (*Τεύχω*, *Τύγχνω*)—*Fatum*, *Fors*, *Fortuna*, *Sors* (*Sortior*)—*Destinée*, *Fatalité*, *Fatal*, *Fortune*, *Lot*—*Fatum Scicksal*, *Looses*, *Geschick*, *Zufall Ungluck*—*Fate*, *Chance*, *Lot*, *Luck* (*Λαγχάνω*), *Hap*, *Fortune*, are so related in usage that it is often difficult and sometimes impos-

sible to determine which idea is the more prominent, the certainty or the uncertainty. The way these words are used, therefore, sometimes as different in meaning and sometimes as synonymous, shows that they are nearly related in theory; nor are they far separated in practice, for in each case, whether it be viewed as Chance or Fate, the use of means is equally unavailing. In this one respect, therefore, the believer in Fate and the believer in Chance stand on the same platform; for neither of them, whatever they may desire, can rationally use means to secure an end; because the use of means is in either case by the nature of the thing and also confessedly useless, or stated in another form, the relation of one thing to another as means to an end does not exist as far as volitions are concerned. This one thing, therefore, is common to Fate and Chance and to the theory of the self-determining power of the will.

The correctness of this view is still further confirmed by the fact that so many of those whose names are great in history as fatalists, have held the theory of contingency as to volitions, that is, in their view of the matter, fatalism and the self-determining power of the will are consistent with each other, and therefore, as far as their testimony goes, both Chance and Fate are equally and for the same reason, namely, because each is exclusive of the use of means to an end, inconsistent with the self-determining power of the agent, that is, with the moral certainty of volitions as the intelligent choice of an agent of known impulses, dispositions, affections and desires, to whom by the very constitution of his nature, some things are agreeable and some disagreeable, some desirable and some undesirable.

On the other hand, in reply to an argument founded on a wide-spread opinion certified by the use of language, it may be asked, is not the phrase, "the freedom of the will," in constant use, and do those who use it mean nothing by it?

These words are indeed in constant use, but taken metaphysically, for we are not now concerned with their theological

signification, they have not one meaning, but two, one corresponding with each theory of the will. As used by some, they mean the freedom as a single faculty, and as used by others, they mean the freedom of the will as including the desires and affections, that is, they mean that the agent is free. Each of these meanings is common as the other, and the one meaning is as true as the other, each in reference to its own theory, but not interchangeably. Taken in one sense, the words are in accord with the self-determining power of the will as a faculty, and taken in the other, they are equally in accord with the self-determining power of the agent; and therefore, as an argument and an objection, they have as much force on the one side as on the other; that is, the phrase "the freedom of the will" can be used neither as an argument for nor as an objection to either theory.

Such are some of the arguments which the advocates of the self-determining power of the agent as opposed to the self-determining power of the will as a separate faculty of the mind; or the same thing stated as to its results, of moral certainty founded on a definite relation of the rational agent and the objects presented to him for choice, as opposed to the contingency of volitions founded on the indifference of the will to anything external to itself as a motive or reason for willing one way rather than another—in regard to these two opposite and opposing theories; such are some of the arguments which the advocates of the one rely on to maintain their own position and some of the objections they make to the theory of their opponents.

### III.

It is now proposed to examine these two theories, assuming first the one and then the other to be true, in their relation to moral philosophy and theology.

First. The essential elements in moral philosophy are, on the one hand, that all rational beings naturally and unavoidably perceive some things to be right, others to be wrong; and on the other, they feel that they ought to do (choose) what they think to be right and refrain from (refuse) doing what they

think to be wrong, both because it is right and wrong and also because they feel that they are accountable for what they do or refrain from doing. The question therefore is, How do these feelings of obligation and accountability, which are real on any theory of the will, stand related to the two theories under consideration.

1st, the theory of the self-determining power of the will or of its sovereignty, is not, as the theory of indifference, consistent with that natural and unavoidable feeling of obligation to what is right, which is felt by all rational beings. For the same thing cannot be felt as a duty and yet, at the same time, be contemplated with indifference, without doing what is wrong. For we ought to be in favor of what is right and opposed to what is wrong. Either, therefore, the feeling of obligation to right and wrong is a delusion, or a feeling of indifference to them is wrong, for both cannot rightfully exist at the same time in regard to the same thing. But the feeling of obligation cannot be denied, because it is intuitive and universal; and, by the theory, the feeling of indifference to the obligation as a reason or motive for discharging it must also exist at the same time in order to the freedom of the volition, and, therefore, also in order to accountability for it. The agent, therefore, must first do what is wrong, namely, contemplate right and wrong with indifference before the will can put forth any volition, good or bad, that is, the agent is so placed by the theory that in virtue of his agency he must do what is wrong, not by chance or mistake or perverseness, but by the nature of his agency, that is, necessarily, and, therefore, the theory is both logically and really destructive of accountability.

On the other hand, on the theory of the self-determining power of the agent, the actor, whatever be his character as good or bad, is accountable for his volitions, because he chooses one way or another, as seems good to him, in view both of the obligation imposed on him by what he considers the right or the wrong of the act contemplated, and also of his accountability for doing what he considers wrong. This freedom which con-

sists in choice in view of obligation is the only kind of freedom necessary to moral agency, because it always carries with it the feeling of obligation and accountability; and sometimes it is the only kind of freedom possible, namely, when the simple issue is presented of doing or refraining. For in this case we must do the one thing or the other, and, therefore, our freedom, and consequently, our accountability, must lie simply and only in choosing one thing rather than another. The freedom of choice, therefore, as an act of the mind in preferring one thing to another on the ground of a supposed moral difference, and the feeling of accountability for the choice made are in accord with that law written in our nature, which imposes right as a matter of obligation and enforces the performance of duty by penalties, which, when incurred, terminate not on the will, but on the agent.

2d. The theory of the self-determining power of the agent is, and that of the self-determining power of the will is not consistent with the universal and practical judgment of men, who, when they wish to determine in a given case whether the actor is worthy of praise or blame, make inquiry as to the motive of his act. But if the will must act independently of motives, then this inquiry is all in vain; for whatever purpose is entertained or whatever end is sought, they can exert no influence as motives to volition, for by the theory the will must be indifferent to them in order that it may be free. On this theory, therefore, men do now and they always have made a great mistake when they undertake to measure the merit or the demerit of an actor by the motives that prompt him. But the theory of the self-determining power of the agent whose choices are made in view of and determined by the view he takes of the grounds presented or the end desired, is manifestly not only in accord with this universal inquiry as to motives, but it is also the ground, and the only ground, on which the inquiry can rationally be made.

3d. The self-determining power of the will, as the theory of contingency, is not in agreement with the observed fact that the volitions of some men, as made known by their conduct, are, as

a rule, one way, and the volitions of others, as a rule, another way. For, if volitions are contingent, the good man is as likely to do wrong as the bad man, and the bad man is as likely to do right as the good man; and this is saying that the principles of the agent, good or bad, are of no account as far as his volitions are concerned. But the theory of the self-determining power of the agent, as the theory of moral certainty on account of the rational connection between volitions and motives, agrees both with the observed tendency of some agents in one direction and of others in another direction, and also with the common belief that good men are less likely to do evil than evil men, and that evil men are less likely to do good than good men.

Secondly. These two theories will now be examined in their relation to theology, by way of attempting to show how they are connected with some of the doctrines alleged or denied to be taught in the Scriptures. For, while theology is neither a system of metaphysics nor of moral philosophy, but a system of truth supernaturally revealed, yet there are some truths (or errors) common to them all, and, therefore, if these truths (or errors) are held in one of the systems, they must, if consistency be preserved, be held in the others.

In discussing this part of the subject, it will serve the cause of order to consider the doctrines in two classes, namely, those which relate more directly to God, and those in which the creature is chiefly concerned.

With regard to the first class of doctrines it is to be remarked, 1st, That the sovereignty of the will, as the theory of contingency, is not compatible with the divine Omniscience. For by the theory volitions are in their own nature as such uncertain, and what is uncertain in itself is not an object of knowledge. All things knowable are in fact known to Omniscience, but the knowledge of what is unknowable is as impossible to God as it is to us. Either, therefore, God does not know what a volition not already made will be, because until it is made it is contingent, and, therefore, His ignorance of it is not a voluntary ignorance, but a matter of necessity in the nature of the volition as

uncertain, something which is not a matter of choice, but to be submitted to as unavoidable; or, if God does know what a volition not yet made will be, then it is not contingent as to its existence, but certain, and then the theory fails. The sovereignty of the will, therefore, as the theory of contingency, and the Omniscience of God cannot be held together. The one or the other must be given up.

This conclusion is not avoided by saying that God is eternal, and, therefore, all things, to us present, past or future, are present to, and, therefore, known by Him. For while the allegation is indeed true in fact, it is also subversive of the theory of contingency; nor can it be maintained that ignorance of future volitions is no defect in God, just as it is no defect in Him that He cannot work a physical impossibility. For what God cannot do now He can never do; but what, by the theory, He does not know now He will learn in the future. He is, therefore, and He always will be increasing in knowledge, but His power is ever the same. In the one case, the impossibility lies in the nature of things external to the Divine nature, for example, matter cannot be both finite and infinite, which is only saying that God cannot be inconsistent with Himself; but in the other case, the defect is in the Divine nature itself, because God, while He remains the same in power, is, and always will be, increasing in knowledge. He is, therefore, at any given time, defective in knowledge, that is, ignorant in comparison with what He will know in the future, that is, God is not changeless in His nature, and then it is hard to understand how He can be eternal in His existence.

On the other hand, the theory of the self-determining power of the agent, as that of rational spontaneity, neither limits the knowledge of God, because a being of a given nature placed in given circumstances must, as rationally intelligent, choose in view of the motives presented to him; nor does it, as the theory of moral certainty, interfere with that natural and unavoidable feeling of obligation always found in connection with the perception of right and wrong, because it does not interfere

with the freedom of choice between the objects presented, because what is certain in the Divine mind can become certain to the agent who makes the volition only after the volition has been made.

2d. The self-determining power of the will, being inconsistent with the Divine knowledge of future volitions, is also inconsistent with the doctrine of the Divine decrees. For how much soever foreknowledge, which depends on the nature of God as Omniscient, differs from foreordination, which depends on the Divine will, the two are so related that the one cannot exist without the other, for no purpose can be entertained in regard to what is unknown; and if the future volitions of rational agents are unknown to God, then no such thing as prophecy can exist in the sense of foretelling events which depend proximately on the will of such agents, and then the fulfilment of alleged,—for it cannot be real,—prophecy fails as an argument for the truth of the Scriptures. The one theory, therefore, is, and the other is not, consistent with the existence of prophecy, even as a possibility, nor with its fulfilment as an argument to prove or disprove anything. For the prediction can be no more than a guess, and its fulfilment is a mere matter of chance.

3d. The view taken of Divine Omniscience determines the view which must be taken of the doctrine of election.

That an election of some kind is taught in the Scriptures is admitted on both sides, and the dispute is as to its ground and end. With regard to the ground of election, it cannot be foreseen faith and good works, if the theory of the will's sovereignty is accepted as true, because faith and the good works on which it depend as a source are acts of the will, and therefore they cannot be foreseen because they are contingent, and being themselves uncertain, they cannot be the certain ground of anything else. On this supposition, therefore, election can only be hypothetical,—that is, if any one believes, he will be elected; and if none believe, none will be elected and none saved; in other words, God did not know when He gave His Son a sacrifice for sin, and He does not know yet what the actual result will be.



Again, the end of election, according to the self-determining power of the will, cannot be unto everlasting life, because that would imply persistence in volitions of the same kind as the result of the indifference of the will to them, and also that a definite, specified object may be certainly attained as the result of contingency. Election, according to this theory of the will, therefore, can only be of some individuals and communities to such states or conditions as in no way depend on their own volitions,—that is, individuals may be in justice, for they are in fact, elected to health or sickness, hereditary wealth or poverty; and nations to the knowledge of the Gospel, or they may be elected to remain in the darkness of heathenism and in ignorance of the only way of life and salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ; but election to these and such like ends cannot be referred to any foreseen use or abuse of the privileges granted or withheld, because obedience and disobedience, being acts of the will, cannot be foreseen; but it must be referred ultimately to God's good pleasure, which, as a fact, bestows on some favors which it withholds from others,—that is, Divine sovereignty, as a principle in the Divine government, holds in some things even against the sovereignty of the creature's will, and in all things it is admitted, on both sides, as an argument or as an objection, to be in full accord with the theory of the self-determining power of the agent.

With regard to the second class of doctrines, namely, those in which the will of the creature is more directly concerned—the first remark is that the view taken of volitions as the act of a will that is indifferent to motives, or that is rationally determined, by them determines the view which must be taken of ability to accept of Christ as He is offered in the Gospel. For the freedom of the will, affirmed or denied in view of the one theory or the other, is, in relation to theology, the doctrine of ability or inability. For if the will must be indifferent to motives in order to volition, then is it not only as competent to accept Christ (without Divine aid) as it is to reject Him, and therefore as likely to do the one as the other; but it is also

true that Divine aid is inadmissible, because it would interfere with the freedom of volition. According to this view, therefore, regeneration, whatever it is, cannot be an effectual calling; for as the Holy Spirit finds the will indifferent to good and evil, so He must leave it as indifferent as He found it; for if He does not so leave it, He would by the act of aiding destroy its nature as free and thereby divest the volition of all moral character.

On the other hand, when the advocates of rational spontaneity deny, as theologians, that the will is free, they mean to affirm not that the agent is not free,—that is, not that he does not choose according to his rational nature in view of the motives presented, for this by their theory is indestructible while the rational agent continues such; but they mean to affirm that the agent, being sinful in his nature, prefers sin to holiness, and therefore chooses to neglect the requirements of the Gospel rather than to comply with them, that he does not forsake sin because he loves it, and being self-righteous in his nature he goes about to establish his own righteousness instead of submitting to the righteousness of God by faith in Jesus Christ. In this case, therefore, the change necessary is one that will enable the moral agent to contemplate motives in a new light, and that will therefore secure volitions of another and totally different kind. The view, therefore, which must be taken of ability and inability in reference to the requirements of the Gospel is one thing or another, as the one theory of the will or the other is accepted as true.

The metaphysical view, therefore, which we take of the will as indifferent to motives or as rationally determined by them, determines the view which we must take, if we are consistent, of the nature and extent of the Divine aid needed in order to turn from the service of Satan to the service of Christ,—that is, it determines the nature of depravity in reference to ability and inability, and this, in its turn, determines the nature and effects of regeneration as a restoration. The views, therefore, held as to the will, of depravity in its relation to ability and

inability and of regeneration, are mutually dependent, and they determine the answer which must be given to the question, What is the work of the Holy Spirit in applying the redemption which is in Christ Jesus? For in the one case, Divine aid is both inadmissible, because the will must be free from all external influences, and unnecessary, because the will, being indifferent, is as competent of itself to accept Christ as it is to reject Him. In the other case, what is needed is not merely persuasion, but regeneration, for persuasion reaches only to choice one way rather than another, when each way is equally according to nature, but it is powerless when one way is in accordance with the nature of the agent and the other contrary to it. The force of truth, therefore, is not sufficient, for it is in the nature of the agent that the volition has its proximate origin. It is, therefore, by way of regenerating the agent, that the Holy Spirit enables him to accept of Christ by a self-originated voluntary act.

2d. The view taken of the will sustains a very important relation to preaching and hearing the Gospel. For if the will as sovereign must be indifferent to the hopes and the fears which the Gospel is calculated to arouse, and which it sometimes does, in fact, arouse, then these hopes and fears can in no way tend as a means towards accepting Christ, nor can a sinful nature lead to rejecting Him. But, according to the theory of rational spontaneity, the knowledge of our lost estate by nature and of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ not only arouses hopes and fears, but these hopes and fears, by their nature as motives and of their own force, tend to lead the hearers of the Gospel to reflection, to read the Scriptures, to prayer, and to outward reformation as a way of escape from the feared consequences of sin, if not from sin itself; and when this way of salvation fails, as it always does fail, the failure arouses the natural enmity of the mind to the grace of God; and then what remains to be done in order to make this external call effectual is the work not of man's power, but of the Holy Ghost.

According to the one theory, therefore, the only certain result of preaching the Gospel is enlightenment, with the chance that the volition may be in the way desired; while according to the other, there is the promise of God that His Word, ordained as a means of grace, will not return unto Him void.

3d. These two theories are very different things when they are viewed in relation to prayer. For in prayer we do not ask God to make us indifferent to good and evil, obedience or disobedience, that our volitions may be free as between them; but we ask Him to give us hearts to love His law, and the disposition and strength to obey it; and, when we pray for others, we assume that the Holy Spirit can enlighten the understanding, arouse the conscience and enlist the affections, and we also assume that the mind thus influenced, effectually called, will choose Christ freely offered in the Gospel. But if the will must be free from all these influences,—that is, if the will must be free from the influence both of a depraved nature on the one hand, and also of Divine aid on the other,—in order that its volition may be free, then prayer for the power of the Holy Spirit is in vain. For, according to the nature of the will as sovereign, no influence can be effectual; and it is worse than in vain in regard to the operations of the will, because any external influence, from whatever source, destroys for the time that indifference, which, by the theory, is necessary to any volition, good or bad.

#### IV.

There is another matter, partly philosophical and partly theological, related on the one hand to God and on the other to the finite rational agent, more important than any of the points that have been considered, namely, the existence of sin, which is a difficulty common to all systems, both of philosophy and theology.

The case from the divine side of it may be stated thus: Sin exists, and at the creation of the universe its existence was foreseen or it was not. If it was not foreseen, then has there

entered into the universe an element upon which God did not calculate when He created it, an element that has totally changed the Divine purpose in reference to it; for now the purpose of God is to make known His excellence by the Gospel, which could not be done if there were no sin. But if the existence of sin was foreseen, then it was to exist either because God was unable to prevent it, or because He did not choose to prevent it. If God was unable to prevent the existence of sin, then His promises are no certain ground of confidence, for if God has been baffled once He may be baffled again; and then upon the intelligent universe has settled a gloom thicker and blacker than that which enveloped Chaos, a darkness which no light follows, an anarchy from which order can never come. Every ground of confidence is gone, and the faith and hope of the Gospel are mere delusions. In order, therefore, to a certain faith and an assured hope, it must be held that God did not prevent sin because He did not choose to prevent. For, if this conclusion be denied, then it must be held either that God was indifferent to the existence of sin,—that is, that He is not a holy God,—or that He is under the control of something external to Himself, as Chance or Fate,—that is, He is not an independent and an omnipotent God; in other words, God is liable to be defeated, and, in this particular case, He has been, in fact, defeated, and that now He is the impotent spectator of a disaster which He could not prevent and of a disorder which He cannot control. But if God is able to do His will, then it must be admitted that sin exists, because God chose that it should exist; and this is the least difficult form in which this difficulty, common to all systems and admitted by all parties, can be viewed and held. It is the least difficult with regard to God, because it saves His independence, His omniscience and His omnipotence; and also to intelligent creatures, because if it be rejected, there is no well-grounded hope, but if it be adopted, there is hope, because there is the possibility, if nothing more, that at the last a satisfactory light may shine upon the present darkness.

On the other hand, when the existence of sin is viewed from the direction of the creature, then the question arises, How does the first act of sin stand related to each of the theories of the will?

When it is viewed in reference to the theory of rational spontaneity, it is to the purpose to remark, 1st, that creatures, because they are finite, are mutable, and in particular because they are not Omniscient, they are liable to be deceived.

2d. It is not necessary to assume that the first sin welled up spontaneously in the mind of the first sinner, until that time pure and holy. For the case of our first parents shows, by way of analogy, that the first sin may have been, and, as far as our knowledge goes, probably was, disobedience to a positive command. In this case, we can see by the light of the same analogy how Satan, without a tempter, by contemplating the reasons for doing or not doing a particular act commanded or forbidden, and not knowing all the reasons of things, may have come to an erroneous conclusion in the same way that our first parents did when they saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise. This degree of knowledge, slight as it is, and unsatisfactory because founded on a single analogy, is all we have, and it is all we need to show that this unique fact, namely, the first act of sin, is not inconsistent with the theory of rational spontaneity. But when the existence of sin is viewed in relation to the theory that the will is sovereign, then at once everything is changed; for then the difficulty is not to account for the existence of sin, but by the theory to account for its non-existence. For if the will must be, and, in fact, is, indifferent, and its volitions, therefore, contingent, then, within the limits of our certain knowledge the non-existence of sin would be not only an inexplicable mystery, but simply an impossibility. For the number of volitions to be made in regard to right and wrong were almost literally innumerable, and that they should be all the same way, passes the utmost limits of belief; and if they were, in fact, all the same way, then the theory itself would fail,

for uniform contingency is in terms an absurdity. According to the theory of contingency, therefore, founded on the will's sovereign indifference to motives as reasons for volition one way rather than another, the existence of sin was as certain as any act of foreordination could have made it.

At this point comes up the last and the great objection, which the advocates of each theory make to the other, namely,—that, according to the theory of their opponents, God is the author of sin.

When it is objected to either theory that, according to it, God is the author of sin, neither party means to deny that God did create and does continue to keep in existence a system in which sin is, in fact, found; but each party affirms that, according to the theory of their opponents, God is the author of sin in the sense that He has done what, on that theory, He had no right to do, and they deny that their own theory carries with it any such consequence.

It is admitted, of course, that, according to the theory of rational spontaneity, taken in connection with the Divine decrees, that the existence of sin was something certainly future when the universe was created, and it is insisted that no one has yet made it apparent that God did anything wrong when he created rational agents such that they were liable to fall, for this would totally prevent the exercise of His creative power, as far as such creatures are concerned, for God cannot make an immutable rational agent, for that would be endowing a creature with one of His own incommunicable attributes; nor can it be proven that God is under any obligation to keep His rational creatures from sinning; for, as a fact, He placed two of them on trial in reference to this very matter of sin. But until it has been proven that to keep moral agents from sinning,—a thing impossible to be done on the supposition that the will has sovereign power over its volitions,—is something God ought to do, it cannot be proven that either the theory of rational spontaneity or the doctrine of the Divine decrees, one or both, taken separately or together, make God the doer of what He had no right to do,—

that is, God is not the author of sin in the sense that He did anything wrong, and this is the only sense in which the words, Author of Sin, have any importance or any meaning in this discussion.

But if the theory of the will's sovereignty is true, and its volitions contingent because the will itself is indifferent to motives as reasons for willing one way rather than another, then sin could not but occur, and its occurrence, as to time and place, circumstances and results, would be entirely beyond God's power to control,—that is, the creation of the universe was the reckless, *venia verbo* creation of a mighty force to be let loose to do its will in spite of any power God had to control it, or in any way to provide an effectual remedy for it. For even the saints in light, unless they cease to be free when they are made perfect in holiness, are, and they will forever be, liable to fall, and as likely to fall as our first parents were or the angels that sinned. For, in the first place, their former experience of sin and misery can exert no effectual influence on a will that must be indifferent in order to be free; and in the next, if their volitions are, in fact, all the same way, then they lack the very element that proves their contingency, and, consequently, their freedom.

According to the one theory, therefore, God can, by His grace confirm His people in holiness and thereby secure them in everlasting blessedness beyond a peradventure, and yet leave them free in their ascriptions of praise and thanksgiving; and, according to the other theory, God cannot confirm His creatures in holiness and happiness in any other way than that of reducing their wills to slavery when they come to the fulness of their excellence as sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty. For if the will is still free, and its volitions, therefore, still contingent, they cannot all be always the same way. No more in Heaven, therefore, than upon the earth, can either God or His people have any certain ground of assurance that sin will not enter into and destroy, in whole or in part, the glorified Church of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

Such are some of the relations which the view we take of the



will sustains to the view we must take, if we are consistent, both of the ground and the extent of our accountability and also of the system of truth contained in the Scriptures, and they are enough to prove that, as the case now stands, there can be only two self-consistent systems of theology,—namely, those known in history as Augustinianism and Pelagianism,—and also to prove that so the matter must remain until another theory of the will is discovered which shall be acknowledged by all parties to be both true in itself and sufficient, as a formative principle, to reduce all the facts in regard to sin and grace to one harmonious whole. Then, and not before, will be formed that third system of theology, for which, during the last fourteen centuries, so many have been seeking with the greatest diligence, but as yet with only a very small degree of success.

## V.

### CHRIST THE TRUTH.

BY REV. D. B. LADY.

"WHAT is truth?" The question in this form was once addressed to Christ, the Source of Wisdom. No more interesting topic for discussion could have been selected. The correct answer, which it was the object of Christ's teachings and life to give, is the key to the philosophy of existence, and marks out for us the path of life. The Roman governor did not wait for the reply. But this is to be taken only as an evidence of his own worldliness or unbelief, or general want of understanding.

"What is truth?" The answer, which first springs up in the mind, is: the facts in the case. The case may be taken from any sphere of existence or inquiry. Whatever the subject may be, the truth is, the facts in regard to that particular subject.

Take a case from our courts of justice. A murder has been committed. At once the manifold and complicated machinery of the law is set to work. There is a coroner's jury to determine how the victim met his death. Detectives are put upon the case to ferret out the criminal. A man is accused of the crime. He is arraigned before a court. There is an imposing array of judges and jury and witnesses and counsel and audience. A systematic and deliberate trial is had, lasting perhaps for weeks. And what is the object of it all? It is to discover whether the accused is guilty of the charge against him, and, if so, what impulse or motive prompted him to the act. The whole purpose is to get at the facts in the case. An attempt is made to reproduce, before the minds of those who administer the laws, what actually took place, and to determine the character of the

act or the class to which it belongs. When this is done the inquiry is at an end. The truth has been discovered.

There is such a thing as the truth of history. We are interested in the doings of our ancestors. We want to know what great movements the nations of the world passed through long before our time. Hence the monuments of antiquity are subjected to the most thorough investigation. Everything that can give us any information, or throw any light upon the past, is examined. An attempt is made by the historian to reproduce, for the modern reader, a correct picture of a departed age. There is room here for misconceptions, erroneous views, false statements. A man may fail entirely to understand the times about which he attempts to write. His facts may be distorted, his logic may be faulty, his conclusions may be absurd; and the impression which he produces may be a wrong one. We have many instances of one age overhauling the evidence and changing the historical conclusions of a previous age. There is no doubt, from past experience, that much of what is now accepted as history will, in course of time, be superseded by more correct views. There is room here for much study and investigation. We have not yet arrived at the ultimate results of historical research. Only when the books give an accurate portrait of the sum of what has transpired in the past will we have the truth of history.

We may also speak of the truth of science. Take the science of astronomy for an example. Centuries ago the Ptolemaic theory was produced as an explanation of the phenomena of day and night and of the varied appearances of the visible heavens. The theory was that the earth was the centre of the system, and that the sun made a daily revolution around it in a certain fixed orbit, and that the moon and the planets and fixed stars also revolved around the earth. This seemed at first a plausible explanation of the movements of the different bodies in the universe visible from the earth. But in course of time and upon further investigation, it was found inadequate to account for the mutations which the earth undergoes and

the changing aspect of the starry heavens. Finally another theory, the Copernican theory, was propounded. This assumes that the sun is the centre of the system, and that the earth and the planets revolve around it. It beautifully accounts not only for the alternation of day and night, but also for the succession of the seasons, the rising and setting of the sun, moon and stars, and the grand progression of the constellations. "Eclipses of the sun and moon are calculated upon this theory, and astronomers are able to predict thereby their commencement, duration, etc., to a minute even hundreds of years before they occur." The Copernican theory thus seems to give us the facts in the case of astronomy, and we may say that it is the truth in regard to the phenomena of the visible universe.

Truth in this form is matter for investigation and thought. It addresses itself to the mind and becomes the contents of our knowledge. As such it is of vast account to us. Mistaken views, opinions, theories mislead the mind and fill it with error. Truth is proper, healthful, invigorating food for the mind. Error is mischievous, poisonous, destructive. It will ruin the brightest intellect and pervert and destroy the grandest mental powers. An imaginary feast will not satisfy hunger or nourish the body. It only aggravates the pangs of starvation and hastens the inevitable hour of death. To discover that what we have looked upon and received as the facts in the case, in any sphere of inquiry, are not the facts in the case, leaves us in a condition at last as undesirable as that in which we were before we investigated the subject. Not to make the discovery of our error is to be in a still worse condition. Truth is light. Error is darkness. The spirit also feeds on truth. It is the nourishment which the mind secures and prepares for the soul, and is a condition of its healthful and harmonious growth.

But there is another aspect of the truth which is of equal importance with that to which our attention has been given. There is a true and a false way of knowing. There is also a true and a false way of acting. The former addresses itself to

the reason, and through it affects the soul. The latter addresses itself to the will and conscience, and passes into deeds, and through these, acts upon the soul. The former has a vast influence upon life; but that of the latter is equally powerful. It is of great consequence that one knows and thinks correctly; but it is of just as great consequence, to say the least, that one resolves upon and does what is right.

The man who is guilty of murder has been untrue to himself and has broken the law of his being. This is a fact, not affirmed, but assumed by the court of justice which makes inquiry into his acts. There is a course of conduct, a strait and narrow way, for every individual in the world; and when he passes the boundaries which hedge in that narrow way he no longer doeth truth, but acts a lie. This phrase, acting a lie, is sometimes used to designate a course of conduct intended to deceive and mislead those who are looking on. It does not mean that here. It means something far deeper and more dangerous. It is intended to denote doing wrong, a thing which is certainly far worse than misunderstanding or misrepresenting that which has been already done. There is here a departure from that which is true, which must be infinitely more disastrous to the soul than any falsehood, held in the form of knowledge.

A nation, in making history, may be as far from the truth as an individual, in writing history. There is a "strait and narrow way" for a government and people as well as for a man or woman. "Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people." As long as a nation does justly, loves mercy and is humble and God-fearing, so long is it in the true path and in the way of the best prosperity and success. But when these foundations are removed and a people become inordinately ambitious, when the rights of men are trampled upon and violence is done to conscience and the law of God, then disasters will most surely follow. Indeed, rightly viewed, this state of things, to be in this condition, is already the greatest disaster that can possibly befall a people. The consequences,

in defeat, decay and death, follow naturally. The end of such a people is only a question of time. They have been acting a lie, sowing falsehoods broadcast in their lives, and only a whirlwind of wrath and destruction can come from such seeds.

This will appear more fully in the third member of the parallel. There is in the case of each planet a moving body in the universe, an orbit in which it swings. The form of this orbit is fixed. It is a circle or an ellipse, or some other well-defined figure. And the inclination of the plane of each planet is fixed. There are certain well-known laws whose operations hold the heavenly bodies to their places. Each one is kept in its own prescribed path. We have the law of gravitation. One body attracts another. The extent of this influence is measured by the quantity of matter in the bodies attracting, and their distance from each other. Then there is the centrifugal force, by reason of which a body in rapid motion seeks to fly from the centre of the circle around which it is revolving. This is measured by the velocity of the moving body. The more rapid the revolution, the stronger the tendency to fly from the centre. These two forces circling upon the planets keep them in their respective orbits. In their movements they are true to the principles which govern them, and move forward harmoniously in obedience to law. But suppose, if such a thing were possible, that a planet should break the law of gravitation. It would at once fly off into space and would probably strike some other body and destroy itself, and make more or less confusion among the heavenly bodies. The balances seem to be so nicely adjusted now that the failure of a single member would probably destroy the harmony, and might possibly result in disaster to the whole solar system.

It is easy to see here the vast difference between a true movement or action and a false movement or false action. And we can also see the great value of true action as contrasted with false action. We can thus bring forcibly to our minds the meaning of the phrase, the truth of action, and the vast

importance of that which is embodied and set forth in this form of words. True or false action may appear in every sphere of life and activity in the world. And true or right action becomes of more account and of greater value as the order in which it finds place rises in the scale of being. It is very important, in the physical universe, that the planets and stars should not wander from their true paths or violate the laws established for the regulation of their movements. The accomplishment of the work which seems to have been assigned to them, their usefulness, possibly their continued existence, depends upon their being true to the law of their movements. The truth of action is infinitely more important in human history and individual conduct. The harmony of historical progress is disturbed and destroyed by false action on the part of nations. National conflicts, war and bloodshed are brought about by a failure to be true and to act truly, on the part of the governments and people of different countries. And these conflicts, sooner or later, result in the destruction of one or more of the nations engaged therein. So all that is worth having in any individual human life, harmony, happiness and success, depends upon the righteousness and truth of human action. Wrongdoing enervates, perverts and destroys the moral nature, unfitting the man to enjoy what is best in this life or the next. Right action, being true, and doing truth, elevate and ennoble the man, strengthen his better nature, bring him into harmony with that in heaven and earth of which he is a part, and secure for him real success in time and in eternity.

What, still, is truth? What object or being in the wide universe, to which man has access, embodies it? In what form is it to be discovered? Where can it be found? We answer, in Christ. He is "the truth," as well as "the way" and "the life." He might have said so to the Roman Governor. But, doubtless, there was in His questioner's heart no basis for the reception or understanding of such a statement. Pilate was not "of the truth." And he would, most likely, have turned a deaf ear to the voice of the Lord.

Christ is the truth as it addresses the mind and heart of man. He is the truth of knowledge. "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God," was the testimony of a pure-hearted and cultured Jew in the days of His flesh. Christ is the Revealer. He makes known to us what is to be known. The woman of Samaria was right when she said: "I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ; when He is come, He will tell us all things." This does not mean that Christ teaches the multiplication-table. The multiplication-table is truth. It is mathematical truth. And that kind of truth is of God. The earth and the heavenly bodies are constructed according to its laws. There is a profound meaning in the words: "Figures do not lie." If they did, the foundations of the physical universe would be removed. But it was not Christ's specific mission to teach that kind of truth. There are other resources in the possession of men for finding out the truth in the sphere of science. Christ taught the truth in the sphere of morality and religion. He made known to us our own nature, the being and character of God, and the relation which man sustains to God. Being Himself God and man, He knew what was in God and what was in man. He was the union between the two, and had brought them together in His own person, and in Him all men can come to God, and God to them. In Him dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily. He that hath seen Him hath seen the Father. In Him God is reconciled to us. In Him we are reconciled to God. God is in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing unto men their trespasses. We are complete in Him. He is our peace, who hath made both one. In His person the gulf which separated man from God is spanned, heaven and earth are joined, and communion between the divine and human is established.

Thus the knowledge of God is brought to the comprehension and understanding of men. This is of the first importance. It is first, at least, in the order of time. Faith in God is necessary to our salvation. But how could we believe on Him of whom we have not heard? Christ taught the people. But He



taught not as other teachers do. The subject of His teaching was not a truth outside of Himself. He preached Himself. And the apostles, who followed Him, preached Christ. He was Himself the plan of salvation. He embodied it. The truth is in Christ. Or, rather, it is Christ. He is its sum and substance. And to know Him is life eternal. He is God as God addresses Himself to man. He is man as man comes to God. In Him the two come together and are one. This He is. This is the great and grand and glorious fact in the case of our salvation. And this we are to know and understand. In this is comprehended the atonement. In this we find our redemption and salvation. This truth regenerates the heart, and fills the soul with light. Christ shines into and illuminates man's moral nature. And darkness, and error, and evil, and sin, are driven away.

We are thus put right in that which is central in human thinking. We come to be poised on Christ as the foundation of all knowledge, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." All our knowing hangs on Him. All our reasoning starts from Him. All our efforts after wisdom are but gropings in the dark and floundering amid a mass of partial truths and errors, if we do not begin and end here. For He is Himself the sum and substance of things, and the solution of the problem of human life in its relation to God and the eternal world. And when we know Christ as He is, and that of which He is the revelation, we have the facts in the grandest case that was ever presented to the human mind for investigation and thought. We know Him in whom the universe stands together, around whom human history revolves, and upon whom every successful individual life is built. We have laid hold upon the truth as it is in Jesus.

Having gained this vantage ground, beginning with Christ and knowing Him, light is shed for us upon all subordinate spheres of knowledge. We can conceive of such a thing as a man understanding even his mathematics better because he knows Christ than if he did not know Him. It is certainly a

help toward understanding lesser mysteries to understand the greatest of all. The health and vigor which the truth, as intellectual food, gives to the mind, increases its capacity for grasping and comprehending other truths which come before it. There is also a sense in which the truth of Christ involves all other truths. And to know Him puts into our hands a key which will unlock the doors of a thousand avenues leading into boundless realms of subordinate inquiry. We can easily see how all other knowledge, in the absence of a knowledge of Christ, must be confused, without order or meaning, fragmentary and unsatisfying. Whilst, on the other hand, when one knows Christ, he can feel that he possesses the root and ground of knowledge. Whatever else he remains ignorant of, its absence is not felt. Whatever else he comes to know falls at once into its proper place and organizes itself in harmonious dependence around the knowledge or truth of Christ.

But Christ is also the truth of action. His conduct, as a man, was absolutely right. He was true to the law of His life. His bodily life, we may infer at least, went forward harmoniously. Health was not sacrificed, in His case, for any sensual gratification. He was neither a glutton nor a wine-bibber, although maliciously and falsely accused as such by His enemies. He neither neglected cleanliness nor exercise. If there was any sacrifice of health on His part, it was to secure a moral end, which was its justification. We know that He laid down His life, at last, in obedience to the will of His Father and for the salvation of men. Such a violation of physical laws, however, is not only not wrong, but it is the highest kind of truth and righteousness. It proves the presence in Christ of the sublimest courage, of a boundless good will towards the race of man, and of a complete subordination of His will to that of the Father, and a confidence in the goodness and wisdom of the Father's purposes such as has never been equalled in the history of the race. In general, we may safely say, that Christ did not transgress the laws of our physical life, except in those cases in which they came in conflict with the great purpose for which He had come into the world.

But especially in Christ's intellectual growth and development, and in His moral conduct, were all the laws of intellectual and moral life fully observed. There was something extraordinary, but nothing magical—perhaps we would be justified in saying, nothing miraculous—in his mental growth and in His wonderfully rapid acquisition of knowledge. It all came naturally, as the result of study and reflection. In moral life He was spotless. Like the paschal lamb, which had for many centuries been a type of Him, He was absolutely without blemish. "Holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners," He could look his accusers in the face and boldly say: "Which of you convinceth me of sin?"

In Christ's conduct, character and life, therefore, we have set forth, in an actualized form, the truth of human action. What our nature is capable of in the way of moral perfection, disinterested service for the welfare of men, and entire obedience to the will of God, is shown in Him. His conduct was holy, and right, and good, and true. He did what the law of His moral life directed, what God designed that a man, made in His image, should do. All human possibilities of holiness and righteousness were realized in Him. That which men of the greatest moral culture and of the best judgment have felt ought to be their conduct and character, was the conduct and character of Christ. His life even went beyond the highest ideal of the perfect life, of which any man, up to that time, had had a conception. His life realized God's thought of human life. And, as the heavens are high above the earth, so are God's thoughts above our thoughts.

Christ taught by precept what we ought to be and what we ought to do. The Sermon on the Mount, the Golden Rule, and the Epitome of the Law, together with the other precepts which He uttered, give us the principles of morality, and are a complete guide for a perfect life. But Christ also taught most powerfully by example. He Himself illustrated and proved the value of His precepts by His life of purity, freedom from sin, and active righteousness. He kept himself unspotted from

the world. His energies were devoted to the elevation of the race and to the honor and glory of God. What a wonderful power rested in the truth of His teachings and in the truth of His actions! We get some idea of it in the results which have followed His life. To those who deny His divinity and His mission from heaven, this power and these results must seem absolutely astonishing and unaccountable.

Christ thus, as the truth, opens our eyes to that which is of the highest value in the sphere of knowledge, and reveals to man the true contents of faith. We are no longer given over to strong delusion, that we might believe a lie. He shows man what he is to know and to believe. He fills out man's capacity for knowing and believing with that which God has provided, as the food of the intellect and the soul, unto everlasting life. Christ also addresses Himself to the conscience and will of man, points out to him the straight and narrow path of moral conduct, which will enable him to realize his nature's sublime possibilities and will commend him to God. It is the veritable opening of a kingdom of light and truth to the blinded vision of him who had fallen under the power of error and belonged to the kingdom of darkness. The entrance of God's Word, God's Son, into the world gave light. The entrance of Christ's words, and the power of them, into the minds and hearts of individuals, giveth light there. They are the words of truth which are able to save our souls. We are sanctified through the truth; His word is truth.

It remains yet to say that there is in the nature of man that which responds to the truth, as uttered by the voice of God, as it comes to view in Christ, or wherever found. You can teach a child that two and two are four. He will accept that statement. He will not permanently accept what contradicts this. The same God who created that which is external to the mind is also the author of the mind and its intuitions. And there is one principle and law, infinitely varied, it is true, in everything. It is the echo of what God Himself is. And it is found also in the mind and heart of man. Hence the facts in each case and

the understanding of man are in harmony. As long as the race is ignorant of anything or holds erroneous views of that with which it comes in contact, it is unsatisfied and restless. Fresh investigations and new discoveries are continually being made. Our ideas and conceptions are being remodeled, and we are getting nearer the truth. Thus we make progress in knowledge. The world is rapidly coming under the dominion of man. His conception and understanding of things corresponds, more and more, as the centuries pass by, with the reality of things. When once the truth is fully known in any sphere of inquiry, the mind is at rest. We do not question or investigate the multiplication-table. It has long since been accepted as final. We are content with it and with all things the knowledge of which is as fixed and certain as the knowledge of this.

The same is true with regard to the truth of religion and the morality belonging to it. No false system of divine worship has ever, for any great length of time, satisfied any portion of the human race. Man's conscience and heart have always told him, that there is a more perfect truth in existence and a better way of life than any that was known to the heathen nations. And the race was restless under that ignorance. Men were continually trying to see if they could by searching find out God. And the revelation made in Christ is better understood now than it has ever been. Not only are the greatest nations of the world at this time Christian nations, but there is throughout the length and breadth of these Christian lands a better understanding, and a clearer and more correct conception of the contents of Christian knowledge and faith than there has ever been before. The morality also of the Bible and of Christ is making its way in the world. The conscience and heart of man approve of it. Those especially who are earnestly desirous of knowing the truth, and doing the right, find in themselves a continually growing sympathy with what Christ taught and practiced. They are "of the truth," and they recognize the voice of the Lord, and obey Him. The truth, as it is in Jesus,

authenticates itself to the mind and heart of him who has not surrendered himself to erroneous beliefs and evil practices.

If what has now been said is correct, the Christian faith and morality must in the end prevail over all the earth. Their progress has been continuous and sure. The eternal years of God are theirs. They are like the star,

"That maketh not haste,  
That taketh not rest."

Their final triumph is only a question of time. And what is this but saying that "the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ," and that "He must reign till He hath put all enemies under His feet." Each individual's apprehension and understanding of the truth also is progressive. We shall "follow on to know the Lord," until the time comes when "we shall know even as also we are known."

## VI.

### THE CREDIBILITY OF THE GOSPEL FOUNDED ON "THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS."\*

BY REV. S. Z. BEAM.

THE Gospel professes to be a revelation of divine truth concerning God, eternity and human destiny, with special reference to the salvation of men. It represents God as interesting Himself in human happiness to such an extent, that He came down from heaven, in the person of His Son, tabernacled in the flesh, took our infirmities, taught heavenly wisdom, bare our sins on the tree, entered the grave, rose again from the dead, returned again to His state of glory, and sent forth the Holy Spirit to inaugurate the Christian Church, for the purpose of carrying on the work of salvation in His name to the end of the world. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3: 16).

Is this true? Is it credible? Some men deny it *in toto*. They regard any revelation from God as unreasonable. They speak of the mysteries necessarily connected with the Gospel, and with the very conception of a divine revelation, as if they were incredible and absurd, because they cannot be understood or comprehended by their reason. They assume that nothing is true that reason cannot discover, or that it cannot fully ex-

\* It would be difficult, if not impossible, to indicate accurately the various sources from which many of the thoughts in this article are derived. But it is desirable to acknowledge, once for all, the writer's indebtedness to a book entitled, "THE CHRIST OF HISTORY: *An Argument grounded in the Facts of His Life on Earth*,"—by John Young, LL.D., Edinburgh. New York: Published by Robert Carter & Brothers, No. 530 Broadway. 1876.

plain. It is not the purpose of this article to attempt an answer to these objections immediately. It is sufficient for the present to say, that "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 1: 14).

In order to apprehend the Gospel, we must be apprehended by the grace which it reveals. In order to know the truth of the Christian revelation, we must have the Christian consciousness. According to the teaching of the Bible itself, Christ is its own inspiration and life, from beginning to end. The Spirit who dictated the truth of revelation is represented as the Spirit of Christ; and Christ is present in Him in all that is written in the Gospel, whether recorded in the Old Testament or in the New. He is also the life of the believer, "born in him the hope of glory," and is, therefore, in him the source of a new and spiritual life, by virtue of which he is brought *en rapport* with the written word.

Whoever thus has Christ *within him* as the source of his life apprehends Christ in the Gospel, and is able to receive His testimony, as, it is in truth, the word of God. Or, in other words, Christ, living in the believer, recognizes Himself in the written word, and by its means authenticates Himself to his consciousness. But the unregenerate cannot receive the truth precisely in the same way; or, as Christ Himself says, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3: 3). It is no great wonder, therefore, that the preaching of the Gospel should appear like foolishness to the worldly-wise, or a stumbling-block to the superstitious. It is no wonder that the pride of learning should take offence at what it cannot understand, or that the wickedness of polished unbelief should antagonize the uncomplimentary and unwelcome declarations of divine revelation. What humbles our pride offends us, and what rebukes our wickedness we regard and treat as rudeness. But the Gospel exposes the one and rebukes the other; and as we are in love with our sin, and subject to the law of sin and



death, we are naturally not in a position to apprehend the truth or to acknowledge its credibility.

Still, the Gospel, according to its own teaching, must be believed, if we are to receive any lasting spiritual benefit from it. We must believe, or we cannot be saved. If we believe not, we must live and die in our sins, and be forever lost.

Such is evidently what the Gospel teaches. Is this true? Is it worthy of credence? Does it afford any rational ground for our faith to rest on? Is there anything in the Gospel (the teachings of the Bible) which is self-authenticating to the mind? Is it at all capable of making itself felt as true to the honest seeker after truth? And can the earnest, honest and anxious soul which seeks for light and for relief, be rewarded by searching the Scriptures?

To all these questions a negative answer might properly be given, if the Scriptures were employed for the purpose of exhibiting abstract truth merely. For it is certain that abstract truth can be apprehended only as the knowledge of it comes to us in a concrete form. Through the visible and tangible only can we come to a knowledge of that which lies back of it, and which is revealed through it as its proper medium. We can, of course, have abstract ideas, and apprehend abstract truths; but our knowledge of them depends, for its existence, on concrete realities, with which they are more or less intimately connected.

Truth can make itself apprehensible to our consciousness when it is presented to us in living concrete forms, but not otherwise. "Annihilate the consciousness of the tangible and visible object," and you destroy thereby the consciousness of its attributes. We cannot form a conception of the attributes of any object, unless we first have some knowledge of the object itself. Hence no truth can authenticate its existence to our consciousness, only as it touches us through the medium of some living form. If it is presented, therefore, as a mere abstraction, it is simply an incredible chimera.

But the Scriptures do not present the truth in any such chimerical form. On the contrary, it there appears in real, living

characters, that may be seen and handled; and any abstract ideas that the Bible may contain are such as grow naturally and spontaneously from the concrete living realities which it presents. Accordingly, Jesus said to the Jews: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of *Me*."

The living reality of the Scriptures is Christ, or God in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself. God without Christ is an abstraction; but in Christ He is a living, concrete, infinite existence, authenticating Himself to our consciousness, as Father and Redeemer. It must be plain to every attentive student of the sacred record, that the one all-absorbing theme, both of Prophecy and Gospel, is the Messiah, the Christ, the divine Saviour of men. All the types, shadows, and sacrifices of the law pointed to the Messiah as the Anti-type and end for which they were instituted. Prophet, Priest and King each, in its way, adumbrated the Messiah, in whom were to be concentrated all the functions of all these offices; and the bloody sacrifices were only shadows of His great sacrifice for the sins of the world. So, we are taught in the New Testament, that everything connected with the Old Testament history and worship was preparatory to the coming of the promised One; and the Old Testament prophecies describe Him in every particular relating to His person, His character, His teaching, His works, His death, His resurrection and exaltation, and declare that, by Him, both Jews and Gentiles shall be delivered.

The New Testament asserts that all these promises are fulfilled in Jesus, whom it sets forth as the Messiah. And as evidence of the truth of this claim, it records His supernatural conception and birth, through the power of the Holy Ghost, His own declarations concerning Himself, His works of wonder, His sufferings, His glorification, His outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the beginnings of the Christian Church, and its first establishment in the cities and provinces of the Roman Empire. And, moreover, St. John informs us, with reference to his Gospel: "These are written that ye might believe that

*Jesus is the Christ*, and that, believing, ye might have life through His name" (John 20: 31), which words apply with equal force to all the other Gospels.

What is thus written is claimed by the writers to have been under the direct guidance and influence of the Holy Spirit, whom they declare to be the Spirit of Christ, communicated to them for the purpose of testifying these things. And, again, Jesus Himself is called "the faithful and true Witness," who has testified all these things.

The all-important question, therefore, is: "Can His testimony be relied on?" If it can, the credibility of the Gospel is settled. And no amount of logic, or philosophy, or science, however learned they may be, will be able to overthrow the credibility of the Bible. For the "Testimony of Jesus" involves the truth of the Old Testament as well as that of the New Testament. They stand or fall together; so that, if Jesus is a true witness, the whole Bible is divine, and its inspiration is established beyond the possibility of successful contradiction. The Old and New Testaments may be said to stand related to each other, as foundation and superstructure; and together they constitute a complete and perfect revelation. Or, perhaps, with greater force, they may be related as body and soul, that is, organically; both being pervaded by the same life, and animated by one and the same Spirit: so that the inspiration of one is the inspiration of the other; and therefore the evidence that proves the truth of one equally establishes that of the other.

Now, if it is true that the Bible presents its supposed truth in living forms and in tangible realities, then the evidence for its credibility must be found in the Scriptures themselves. And if Jesus is a true witness, His testimony, which the Scriptures call "the Spirit of Prophecy," must be sufficient to sustain their truthfulness against all forms of opposition.

But the testimony of Jesus depends, for its value, upon what *He is*. His personal character must be taken into full account before we can confidently accept His testimony. In any court

of justice the testimony of the witnesses is valuable in proportion to their veracity. Accordingly, the testimony of a single witness, whose moral character is without reproach, and whose veracity is known, will be of greater weight than that of ten men who are known to be guilty of falsehood and perjury. The same principle holds good in the study of history, or of any branch of knowledge. If the writer whom we study is known to be trustworthy, we take his statements of facts for truth without gainsaying. But if we know him to be unreliable, we compare him with others who have written on the same subject, and we subject him to a sifting process, so as to be able to extract whatever truth he records from the mass of errors with which it is mingled; and after a thorough elimination of his errors, we give him credit for the truth that remains. Or, if we are unacquainted with an author, we must study him from his own standpoint, and with special reference to that branch of knowledge of which he treats. If he is found to be ignorant, or unreliable, or untruthful, we cannot accept his testimony without subjecting it to the severest scrutiny. If his character is bad, it is difficult to trust him even when he tells the truth. "We fear the Greeks, even when they come bearing presents." But if we are once convinced that our witness understands his subject, has a good moral character, and is a man of known veracity, we can, with a good degree of certainty, rely upon his testimony. Still, in every case, in order to obtain the truth, we must be truthful students, honestly seeking light, and in some sort of sympathy with the truth. We must lay aside all pre-judgment in the case, and with an unbiased mind lay ourselves open to conviction. For it is a foregone conclusion that no one who has first shut up his mind against the truth, before he begins the search, can ever come to a knowledge of it.

Now, in order to determine the value of the testimony of Jesus, we must, therefore, inquire what He is. If His personal character, as a man among men, shows Him to be, in every sense, worthy of our unlimited confidence; if we find His moral

character without a stain, His veracity unimpeachable, His conduct characterized by the most perfect sincerity, and His wisdom passing the wisdom of men, there can be no possible reason to doubt the truth of His testimony, or to reject the Gospel, whose credibility is sustained by such conclusive evidence. On the contrary, the mind that is left in doubt, in the face of such testimony, must be warped by the most unreasonable moral obliquity, and darkened, in its understanding, by the most wilful ignorance.

Now let us take the New Testament just as it is. Assume simply that it exists, and that it describes the circumstances amid which a person, whom it names Jesus, was born and reared; records what it declares to be His words; asserts that He did certain works of wonder, nearly in all cases, for the benefit of persons in need; that He taught divine truth; was meek and gentle in His deportment; that He exercised an influence upon the minds of men, which, in some instances, compelled them to admit that He was doing the works of God, and, in other cases, led them to denounce Him as one possessed of demoniac power, and, in other instances, filled them with terror; that He provoked the contradiction of sinners, suffered an ignominious death at their hands, rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and, according to a promise made to His disciples, sent upon them the Holy Ghost, who gave them courage to preach Him as the great and almighty Saviour of men, and thus so completely filled them with His own inspiration, that they cheerfully sacrificed every earthly comfort, and even life itself, for the sake of advancing His cause in the world.

In this record He is also made to claim for Himself an equality with God in power, in wisdom, in goodness, in the government of the world, and in the prerogative of forgiving sins. In a word, the Gospel professes to be the written record of what Jesus said of Himself, of what He did to illustrate His teaching, and of how He said and did these things, in order to fulfil the promises of the Old Testament, and showed thereby that He was the Messiah, and, as such, came to redeem and

save the world from the burden and curse of sin. In all which He is made to appear as His own witness. And His words and works, taken together, form the personal testimony which He bore. Is now this testimony to be trusted? Can we believe it?

We do not now stop to ask, whether such a person ever existed. He either is a real living person, or else the writers of the New Testament exhibit powers of imagination and inventive genius which far transcend those of any other fictitious writers that ever lived, in ancient or modern times. Indeed, they would appear to rise so far above all other writers of every class, both morally and intellectually, that their superiority could only be accounted for on the supposition that they possessed superhuman wisdom, and yet their record is false!

We now, therefore, take up and study the character described in their writings, taking for granted His existence, which few, if any, at this day, will have the hardihood to deny; and if He be found, in every particular, worthy of our confidence, His testimony must be received as true, and the credibility of the Bible established.

His supernatural birth and the wonderful phenomena attending it must be passed over; for they can only be received as true on the supposition that His testimony is worthy of credence.

It must not be overlooked, that His reputed parents were poor; that they lived in an obscure village, in an obscure part of the country, and far removed from the busy scenes of commercial cities, and away from the great centres of intellectual activity. In the little country village of Nazareth, amid the associations of its rustic inhabitants, and accustomed to their rude, unpolished and uncultured manners, He grew up from infancy to youth and manhood in entire innocence and ignorance of the wisdom, the culture and refinement of the world. He labored at the carpenter trade, with His foster-father, to aid in securing a decent livelihood for Himself and mother. He had little or no opportunity afforded Him for securing a

liberal education. An attention to these facts must have great weight in our minds when we come to estimate His character, and to form a judgment as to the trustworthiness of His testimony.

He delivered His first conscious testimony concerning Himself at the age of twelve years, in the following memorable and significant words: "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" Words which contain, in germ, all that He afterwards did by way of fulfilling His mission among men, and which clearly show that from the very start He laid claim to the dignity of divine Sonship, and intimated whose work He came to do.

When Jesus was about thirty years old, John the Baptist, an exceedingly popular, but stern preacher of righteousness, appeared. This man exposed the sins of the people in the most unsparing terms, threatening them with the "wrath to come," unless they would flee from it, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance. To those who came John administered the rite of baptism, as a preparation for the kingdom of heaven, which, he alleged, was about to appear. But when Jesus came to his baptism, the stern man at once relaxed, and said: "I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me?" It is evident from these words, that John recognized in Jesus a man who did not, in his estimation, need repentance or baptism. This opinion was not the effect of the revelation which John is said to have had concerning Him, or of the alleged visible appearance of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove. For it was only after the baptism that this took place. And in consequence of this appearance after His baptism, John said: "I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God."\* Before this he said: "I knew Him not."† But John did know Him personally, for he was second cousin to Jesus, and could not well have been ignorant of Him. Hence we may, without hesitation, assert that the words which John addressed to Jesus were intended as an acknowledgment of His moral and religious

\* John 1: 34.

† John 1: 33.

purity simply as a man; while the words afterwards uttered about Him convey the intelligence concerning His divinity, which John professes to have received by revelation. It is only his manhood that concerns us in this discussion.

What John said to Him was doubtless an expression of the general opinion of all who knew Him. In reply to John's modest refusal, Jesus simply said, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."\* And from this time on John finds his chief delight in pointing Him out as the "Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world."† In the course of John's wonderful statements concerning Him, he declares, "He that hath received *His testimony* hath set to his seal that God is true."‡

Jesus set out on His ministry as a teacher sent from God, and begins with the startling announcement, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,"§ meaning thereby, that this kingdom is embodied in Himself as its Head, and that, for those who repent and believe in Him, it is a kingdom of grace and truth, by which they will be freed from the bondage of sin, and secured in the possession of everlasting life and glory. As King in this kingdom of truth, He set Himself like a flint against all forms of error, denouncing sin and vice without stint, and defending truth and righteousness with the most unswerving fidelity. And although He claimed to be the Messiah, He came into open and irreconcilable conflict with all the ideas entertained by his contemporaries, with respect to that "Hope of Israel." He rejected entirely the notion of an earthly kingdom, though He might have made Himself popular by accepting it. He said, "My kingdom is not of this world." If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews; "but now is my kingdom not from hence."|| And then to the question of Pilate, "Art Thou a King, then?" He answered, "Thou sayest that I am a King. To this end was I born, and for this cause came

\*Matt. 3:15.

†John 1:29.

‡John 3:33.

§Matt. 4:17.

||John 18:36.



I into the world, that I should *bear witness to the truth*. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice."\* And, however this idea of the Messianic Kingdom differed from that of the people, it was in perfect harmony with all His conduct and teaching.

In His intercourse with men, no one was too mean to attract His favorable attention, if he was in need or in distress, and no one too exalted to feel the poignant sting of His rebuke, if he was guilty of cruelty, or wilful falsehood. He was always, and uniformly, on the side of virtue, and unrelenting in His denunciations of vice; and the more so, where men were vicious in spite of their better judgment.

His interpretation of the law fully accords with this principle; and in the sermon on the mount He unfolded the inner sense and meaning of the law, presenting it in a light that was never dreamed of by the Scribes and Pharisees, or at least, in which it was never practiced by them.

By them it had been degraded to the level of a series of civil statutes, requiring the punishment by the civil authorities, of outward acts of transgression. But the sublime principle of love to God and man which underlies it as substruction, or deepest foundation, they had not discovered. They had seen, as it were, the outward superstructure, but its foundation was out of sight, and beyond the reach of their moral ken. But Jesus in a few simple, but well-chosen words, lets in a flood of light, that shows in bold and grand relief, its innermost sense, demonstrating in the clearest terms, that the outward prohibitions of the law refer, primarily, to the motives, the springs of action, in the inmost depth of man's moral nature, in order to prevent the possibility of outward violation, and consequent penalty.

"Thou shalt not kill," according to His teaching, means—thou shalt not permit hatred, or ill-will, in any sense, to rise in your hearts, but, on the contrary, thou shalt love thine enemy, not harbor revenge against him or retaliate an injury, but rather do him good.†

\*John 18 : 37.

† Confer. Matt. v. 21-26, 38—48.

"Thou shalt not commit adultery," according to His testimony, means that the very first beginnings of lust, in the heart, must be resisted and suppressed.\*

And so, according to His teaching, all the other commandments, are designed to reach in their deepest sense, the moral centre of our being, and respect the highest faculties of our spiritual nature, and our highest interests and happiness are made dependent on our obedience to these statutes. The law is regarded, by Him, not in the light of a series of arbitrary commandments, merely to gratify the will of the Supreme Law-giver, but as a system of necessary rules perfectly adapted to the needs of man's spiritual nature, obedience to which, advances and disobedience destroys our highest happiness. According to this the divine law suits, in the minutest particulars, our nature, considered ethically, psychologically or somatically. And to enforce this teaching, Jesus Himself set the example of the most perfect obedience, always going about doing good; that, according to the record, not a single word or act of His, in any sense, antagonized the divine law. He was in harmony with it both in letter and spirit, as He said Himself, "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil the law.†" And so highly did He estimate the very least commandments, that He called him the very least in the kingdom of heaven who should break *one* of them, and him great, who should obey them.

In the matter of obedience He differs radically from any other good man whose name is recorded in history, sacred or profane. The Bible names many noble men, whose lives were devoted to the service of God, whom it designates as the friends of God, and as having enjoyed His peculiar favors. Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in earlier ages; afterwards Moses, Joshua, Elijah, David, Solomon, Daniel, and many other prophets, priests, and kings, are honorably mentioned on account of their peculiar moral excellence and spiritual elevation. But yet all these noble and God-fearing men were ever con-

\*Matt. v. 27—32.

†Matt. v. 17. 19.

fessing their sins, doubtful as to the best course of conduct to be pursued, wavering in their faith, and deploring the mistakes, which forced from their eyes, scalding tears of penitence, and from their lips humiliating acknowledgments of their guilt.

In the case of Jesus, on the contrary, we never hear a confession of sin, we never witness the slightest hesitation, either in the expression of an opinion or in the course of conduct to be pursued. In Him, there was no doubt. Without apparent consideration or study He always said the right thing at the right time. However suddenly or unexpectedly, curious questions were asked Him, He never failed to answer them with the most perfect ease, and with a profounder understanding than has ever been manifested by the wisest of men.

There is no evidence in the record, that He ever repented, or changed His views on any subject, after once having expressed them. The history of all other wise and good men shows that they became such only by repenting of mistakes and correcting their false views. But it was not so with Jesus. The views of Jesus often aroused the antagonism of the people, or rather of their leaders, because they contradicted the "common sense" of men, and His acts equally offended their pride, or their taste or their manners; but He never took back a word He had spoken, or tried to undo any thing He had done.

And even in the darkest period of His ministry, when He knew that His enemies were closing in upon him with every facility at their disposal, for accomplishing His ruin, and an ignominious death stared Him in the face, He was perfectly confident of the righteousness of His cause, of the correctness of His own course of conduct, and the success of His mission. At a time when any other man would either have\* encouraged his followers to resistance, or given up His cause in despair, Jesus did neither, but cheerfully consented to die; serenely telling His disciples that He was about to die, and amazing them with the assurance, nevertheless, that He was about to establish an eternal kingdom.

\*John xviii. 36.

He believed that He was the Son of God and was possessed with "the power of an endless life, which would give Him ultimate victory over death and put Him into a position to establish and carry on His kingdom eternally, by means of which He expected to gather, defend, and preserve all His redeemed people unto eternal life. In this faith He confidently asserted, to the weeping sisters at the grave of Lazarus, I am the resurrection and the life," etc.\*

Again, in full accord with this firm faith, and with unwavering confidence, He taught the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, not as a mere pleasing conjecture, but as an undoubted and imperishable reality, thus settling forever, for Himself and His followers, the momentous question which had, in all ages, agitated the minds of man,—a question which had baffled the most serious efforts of the wisest sages and philosophers as often as they attempted to solve it: "If a man die shall he live?" All that Job could answer was, "All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come. Thou shalt call and I will answer Thee; Thou wilt have a desire to the work of Thine own hands."† Here was an expression, indeed, of a blessed hope, but certainly not an assured confidence, or a clear conception of a conscious life beyond the grave.

Such philosophers as Socrates and Plato, whose learning and excellence of moral character are nowhere surpassed, and seldom, if ever, equaled among the sages of antiquity, though they put forth their utmost endeavors to prove the immortality of the soul, were yet never certain. The arguments that seemed to be irresistible at one time would be refuted by their reasoning at another. Hence they never enjoyed the pleasure of undisturbed certitude.

But Jesus asserted, or assumed this doctrine, as if it was self-evident to His consciousness at all times. His language and conduct demonstrate that He enjoyed the most undoubted certitude on this all-important question, and hence spoke with authority.

\* John xi. 25.

† Job 14: 14, 15.

Other wise men have arrived at their conclusions only after the most painstaking and laborious study, and in order to obtain knowledge they read the writings of famous men, and traveled from country to country, at great toil and expense, interrogating other wise men, priests and statesmen, prying into the secrets of religion and science, many of them spending a long life-time in the earnest, honest search after wisdom; yet in the end they found that much of their wisdom was worthless and in many things they were not certain of the profoundest truths they uttered. Thus many of the noblest ornaments of our race, whose names adorn the pages of history, and the light of whose lives sheds a glorious halo on the ages and countries in which they lived, attained their honored preëminence through untold toil and trouble, and yet, by their own confessions, they were ignorant, at the end, concerning the most important problems of life, which they sought to solve.

But the words of Jesus flowed from his lips with a kind of spontaneity, expressing the truth with an absolute certitude that compelled men to say, "He spake with authority; never man spake like this man." And yet there is no evidence that Jesus ever read any book but the Bible, that He ever sat at the feet of a master, except Joseph and Mary, or was in any sense familiar with the writings of ancient sages and philosophers. On the contrary, He came forth from the workshop at Nazareth, and from the very start began to utter the most precious and profound truths that ever greeted the astonished ears of man. His life of public activity was confined to the narrow circle of three years in time, and of the small country of Palestine; yet in that short time, and within that narrow sphere, He elaborated a system of morals and religion answering to the needs of man's ethical and spiritual nature, such as none of the philosophers ever conceived, and such as all their wisdom combined cannot rival,—a system which has successfully stood the test of a trial of nineteen hundred years, which has withstood the most varied learning and persistent efforts that the most cultivated minds could bring to the conflict, and which still

stands before the world, in all its sublime grandeur, without a peer, and, judging from the present activity of His church and her conquests, His system promises to outlive all systems of philosophy that may be devised, and conceived in a spirit that is antagonistic to the Gospel. And this system is a simple and spontaneous evolution of His own unaided mind and heart, founded in love, carried out by Himself in love, consecrated to the service and interest of men by the complete devotion and sacrifice of Himself, and by His command carried forward, and sustained among men by the persuasive eloquence of love alone.

Other teachers of philosophy, religion and morals, while engaged in the laudable work of imparting wisdom to others, have been accustomed universally to assume for themselves the attitude of learners. They have taught from the standpoint of learners, giving instructions in such knowledge as they had acquired by severe mental struggles and discipline. Zeno, Socrates and Plato, in Greece; Confucius, in China; Zoroaster, in Persia; Buddha in India, and all other teachers, without exception, found and wrestled with puzzling questions, which they could not answer, problems which they could not solve with certainty, many of which are, to-day, as dark and mysterious to the unaided human mind as they were in the remotest antiquity.

But Jesus uniformly taught as One who knew the certainty of the things He uttered, affirming that He knew them immediately from personal communion with the secret things of God. Hence, when teaching Nicodemus the necessity of the birth from above,—to the latter an inscrutable mystery,—which called forth his doubtful question, "Can a man be born when he is old?" Jesus, with artless simplicity, genuine sincerity, and absolute certitude, said, "We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen. If I have told you earthly things, and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you heavenly things?"\* These words are spoken in such matter-

\* John 3: 11, 12.

of-fact way that they seem like the most natural answer that could have been given to the question; and so Jesus spoke them without an effort, as if a certain knowledge of heavenly things was his natural possession, and the communication of them to others His peculiar prerogative.

His doctrines concerning God and heaven and man's destiny He announced as divine and undoubted truths, which He had received in heaven itself, and his reputed miracles He attributed to the power and Spirit of God, alleging that His intimacy with the great Father of all gave Him authority to do and say these things. When His statements were contradicted, He never attempted to prove their correctness by logical ratiocination, but appealed to the Scriptures, to the purity of His own character, or to the extraordinary nature of His works, which no one ventured to deny; and at the same time positively asserted that He had seen these things with His Father, and did only those things that pleased Him.

When His enemies attempted to entangle Him in His talk by hard questions, He invariably, without the slightest hesitation, gave them a satisfactory answer, or, at least, an answer that put them to silence. And when they imagined they had prepared the way to entrap Him, and that His answer must involve Him in contradiction with Himself, or with the Scriptures, or incur the displeasure of the rulers, to their surprise, and often confusion, with consummate wisdom, and a deep insight into their secret hypocritical purposes, He gave such answers as did not conflict with His own teaching, or with the Scriptures, or offend the rulers, and which completely unmasked the wickedness of His inquisitors and defeated their evil designs. And then, to add to their discomfiture, He often compelled them, by the simplest questions, to answer to their own confusion, or to acknowledge their ignorance concerning the very things with which they plumed themselves on their familiarity.\*

But, notwithstanding He was victorious in every conflict,

\* Confer. Matt. xxii.

He never boasted, or offensively triumphed, over His defeated adversaries. On the contrary, He ever treated them with the kindest consideration, and displayed the greatest anxiety for their moral and spiritual improvement. At the end of every struggle He left them to meditate on the heavenly truths which He taught them, while He retired into the wilderness of some private retreat to refresh Himself by holding communion with that God whom He called His Father.

When His enemies charged Him with heresy, or of being in league with Satan, we never hear Him angrily retorting or reviling in return. But He simply replies, "Which of you convicteth me of sin? And if I say the truth, why do ye not believe me? He that is of God heareth God's words; ye, therefore, hear them not, because ye are not of God."\* And when an officer struck Him, He simply said, "If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil; but if well, why smitest thou me?"† In all His conflicts, and amid the greatest provocations, He never betrays any excitement, or so far forgets Himself as to speak rashly, or unadvisedly, with His lips, or to ignore the proprieties of good manners. But in the midst of the insults which the rudeness of unreasonable men cast upon Him, He ever calmly preserves His equanimity, and never loses sight of the great purpose with which He began His ministry,—namely, to make God known to the people, and to interest them in the solemn realities of the life to come.

Professing to have a certain work to do, He never allowed anything, for a single moment, to distract his attention from it. Not even the fear of death or the dissuasions of loving, but mistaken friendship, could move Him from His predetermined purpose.‡ At no time does He seem to feel unequal to the task He had undertaken to perform; but, on the contrary, both by word and act, He declares His fitness to accomplish His purpose, no matter what barriers may be laid in His way. On many occasions He expresses, with assurance, His own personal perfection, and His official greatness, in language which

\* John viii. 46, 47.

† John viii. 23.

‡ Matt. xvi. 21, 23.



would be blasphemous if not true: "I am not alone, for the Father is with me."\* "I and my Father are one."† "My Father worketh hitherto and I work."‡ "He that sent me is with me; the Father hath not left me alone, for I do always those things that please Him."§ "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work."|| It is easy to see, in all these words, that Jesus was convinced that He had a great work to do; that there was an inward oneness and community of life and purpose between Himself and God; and that He was not alone in what He taught and did, but was supported by the power of God the Father, who was with Him.

He had an inward consciousness, accordingly, that He was not unfolding His own thoughts simply, or doing His own will merely, but the thoughts and will of His Father; and that there was an unbroken and perfect harmony between Himself and the Father, by which they worked together to finish His great and merciful undertaking. That undertaking He declares to be the impartation of life to men by the voluntary sacrifice of Himself—a sacrifice which is plainly seen by every intelligent reader to consist in a life of constant self-denial, of personal privation, and in an unconquerable purpose to do good to others whether they did good to Him or not; and, at last, in laying down His life as a ransom for dying sinners. And in strict harmony with this immutable purpose, Jesus never allowed an opportunity of doing good to pass by unimproved.

Requiring rectitude of moral character and a sincere love of truth in others, He never failed to set before them a perfect example in His own life; and thereby He exhibited a radical difference between Himself and all other religious teachers. Good men universally teach better than they practice. In all the range of religious literature not a single character is described, who succeeded fully in putting His own best precepts into practice, or who perfectly satisfied the demands of ordinary moral law, as laid down in the philosophies. Not one ever pro-

\* John xvi. 32.    † Chapter 10 : 30.    ‡ 5 : 17.    § 8 : 29.    || 4 : 34.

claimed himself as an example without fault; and no biographer has ever claimed perfection for his hero, all feeling that "Perfection is an exotic of celestial birth."

But the very best men have, in every instance, attained their good moral and spiritual character by means of a course of severe discipline, protracted often through a long life of struggling against inward infirmities, evil propensities, and outward temptations. And no one has ever passed the ordeal without mistakes which they had to rectify, lapses from which they had to rise with great effort, and wearisome toil, and sins of which they had bitterly to repent. And all have acknowledged, at the end of such a course of discipline, that after all they were far from attaining perfection. This is not stated for the discredit of good men, but rather for their credit, since it plainly shows how difficult, and even impossible, it is for human nature to extricate itself from a labyrinth of evil, and to rise above its own imperfections, which it suffers in consequence of sin; and how, only by severe discipline and toilsome efforts, the best of men have painfully freed themselves, only in a partial way, from the demoralizing and miserable effects of sin.

But in the person of Jesus none of these defects appear. Morally and mentally He is as perfect at the beginning as at the end of His ministry. Though in the midst of daily conflict and struggle, it was always on account of others and in their behalf. He had no mistakes to rectify, no lapses from which to recover, no sins to repent of. Every precept that He preached He practiced, and never at any time did He confess a sin or a mistake or an imperfection. Religion pure and undefiled was the element in which He lived; on all occasions directing men's thoughts to spiritual things and insisting on a life of purity and holiness as absolutely necessary to please God; and His own happiest moments were those in which He was specially engaged in communion with God. Whole nights He spent in such communion, by which He was refreshed and strengthened for the labors of the following days, and all His days were spent in unselfish devotion to the comfort and happi-

ness of others, without any apparent consideration whatever for His own convenience or interest. In doing such work for men and in exercising such piety towards God, He seemed to find His chief delight. And although, at any time, He might have taken advantage of the wishes of the people, and secured earthly preferment and place, yet He never attempted to do so, but preferred to teach and to go about among the poor and needy, and to show the tenderest sympathy for all classes of sufferers by healing their diseases and speaking words of comfort. In all His intercourse with men He practically taught the universal brotherhood of man, and enforced the doctrine by the exercise of unfailing and unchanging love. In harmony with this He unequivocally taught the universal Fatherhood of God, and man's entire dependence on Him, and his responsibility to Him. This again involved the doctrine of monotheism, in contrast with all forms and phases of polytheism, which had been invented by other religious teachers, and made all men the offspring and dependents of the one true and eternal God. Yet He represented this one God in a three-fold personality, a mystery, of course, which we cannot understand, yet a mystery that answers to the inward spiritual necessities of our nature. Herein the teaching of Jesus far transcends that of any of the sages of antiquity. They, indeed, generally believed in a supreme deity, yet they associated with him myriads of inferior and subordinate deities in the government of the world.

Even Socrates, the wisest and best among the philosophers, could never entirely escape the toils of polytheism.

In the teaching of Jesus, furthermore, a God of infinite love and mercy is made known, who is full of compassion and long-suffering, yet who cannot, and will not, clear the guilty; a God who will have mercy, and not sacrifice; who is moved to forgiveness far more easily by heart-felt, penitent grief than by hecatombs of sacrifices; who loves justice, but takes special delight in showing mercy; a God who is absolutely free from the passions, and whims, and vengeful feelings, attributed to the gods of paganism by their votaries. Unlike the gods of

heathenism, the three persons in the Trinity of the Godhead, as represented in the teaching of Jesus, are in perfect and perpetual harmony, both in counsel and in work, working together in unity for the interest and happiness of men, and never taking pleasure in human suffering. He is, therefore, to be revered and loved for His unfailing and unchanging goodness towards His creatures, and, not like the gods of the nations, to be hated and feared for cruelty and vindictiveness. And while we cannot comprehend such a glorious Being, yet everything that is said of Him, in the testimony of Jesus, is far more worthy of a real God than the descriptions of the gods of mythology found in the sacred books of other religions. He is, therefore, infinitely better than such gods, even our enemies themselves being judges.\*

But, besides the verbal testimony of Jesus to the infinitely exalted character of God, we have, what makes this testimony all the more valuable and trustworthy, in the person of Jesus Himself, an exhibition of moral perfection. In Him we behold a living image of God, personally moving among men, clothed in their own nature, teaching them by precept and actual example, not only what God is, but also the excellent principles which they must carry out in order to enjoy His favor. Conformity to the image of God, as this is exhibited in the life of Jesus, is laid down as requisite in order to acceptable worship. And this image represents, in a living form among men, all the graces which, in their union, constitute the divine ideal of a perfect manhood. This image, then, forms the model after which all must endeavor to build up their characters, who would enjoy a full and complete deliverance from sin, and a union with God, who is the source and fountain of all happiness.

Jesus, in the character represented here, claimed to embody in Himself the fulness of God, and to make known the two opposite, but complementary attributes of the Deity, called justice and mercy. Claiming to be God joined in personal union with our nature, which He professes to prove by His wisdom,

\* Deut. 32: 31.

His exalted character, and His stupendous miracles, He also undertook to satisfy the claims of divine justice by an atonement, which involved the sacrifice of Himself. This atonement (at-one-ment) included the incarnation and all that He did and suffered, even to the descent into hades, and the resurrection and ascension into heaven. Accordingly, for this purpose, by His own word, He put Himself in the sinner's place, bore his sins in His own body on the tree, and took them away, thus vindicating and satisfying, by His own obedience and sacrifice, the entire demand of the law against us, so as to open the way for a just and holy God to be just in justifying the sinner. Thus "He was made sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." \* In this way He practically proclaimed the Lord God merciful and gracious, and full of compassion, but by no means justifying the sinner in his sins. He first delivers man from the curse of sin, by a priceless ransom, and *then* proclaims forgiveness on condition of penitence and faith in Christ, the faithful and true witness, whose testimony was sealed by His true martyr-blood, and was afterwards vindicated by the Spirit of Christ, convicting the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment.† According to the record, God's justice or righteousness is manifested in all its terrors in the sufferings of Christ; for in it His righteousness was fully declared, and by it His forbearance and mercy are fully secured for the remission of sins, in which we receive free grace through the redemption that is in Christ, by which we are justified.‡

All this is declared to be revealed to make known the character of God to men, and to carry out His purpose to save them from their sins by the introduction of a new principle of life into their own nature, to afford them the means of appropriating this life, and so to fit themselves for a life of eternal blessedness and peace.

What is written concerning this exalted destiny for men is claimed to be by inspiration of God.§ The Holy Spirit is

\* 2 Cor. 5: 21.

† John 16: 8.

‡ Rom. 4.

§ 2 Tim. 3: 16; 2 Tim. 1: 21.

claimed to have been in the writers, directing them to make an infallible record of all that God wished men to know of Himself, of eternity, and of their own glorious destiny, which He has secured for them by the great salvation. The work of salvation, it is further declared, is carried on in them by the same Holy Spirit testifying in them and by them of the Christ, guiding and comforting them amid the trials of this life, and so fitting them for the enjoyment of heavenly joys and glory. This Spirit is also called the Spirit of Christ, by whose agency He is born in His people the hope of glory; and so Christ being in them the hope of glory, and in the written word as the Spirit of prophecy, or as its life and inspiration, He fills both the word and the believer with the light of His own divine-human life, creating an inward harmony, and thus enabling the believer to appreciate and appropriate the inner sense and meaning of His word. Here, it may be said, is *the right* rule for the interpretation of the Bible, however many other rules the philosophers, and scientists, and critics may lay down for us.

Accordingly, the study of the Bible from the purely skeptical standpoint, no matter how much learning or scientific acumen may be brought into the service, will be as likely to confirm the student in his unbelief as to convince him of the truth. But, on the contrary, an honest, unprejudiced inquirer after truth cannot fail to find it, if he searches for it in the sacred Scriptures. To such a person, the life and character of Jesus, together with His verbal testimony, as recorded in the New Testament, will become an infallible proof of the authenticity of the Bible, which no logic can set aside. For no really honest student can contemplate the glorious character of Christ, as it stands out before us in the simple, unadorned narrative recorded in the New Testament, without acknowledging His sincerity, His truthfulness, His purity, His wisdom, His power; and, in fact, no one who loves truth can deny to Him any of the excellences that contribute to the formation of a perfect moral character. And this once admitted, it follows, with all

the force of an axiom, that His testimony is absolutely and infallibly true. Who, then, with a knowledge of the character of Christ, can honestly doubt or deny the truth of the entire, or any part of the Bible? For the testimony of Jesus involves the credibility of the whole Bible from beginning to end. He always spoke of, and quoted from, the Old Testament, as the word of God, and as of divine authority. It seems clear, from all this, that the authenticity of the Bible is fully established by the testimony of Jesus. Can a man of such a moral character as that of Jesus, by any possibility, be charged with falsehood?

Can a man of such unerring wisdom be deceived or mistaken in His utterances? Such an idea would be more incredible than anything recorded in the Bible.

If any one, therefore, will study the testimony of Jesus with an earnest, honest purpose to find the truth, he cannot fail to succeed. And blessed experience has demonstrated that God will bless such endeavors, to the highest interest and happiness of such honest seekers after truth.

Innumerable examples might be introduced here to show how completely the divine oracles authenticate their truth to the mind and heart, when studied in the spirit of earnest inquiry, and that they contain within themselves the evidence of their inspiration. But the words and moral character of Jesus, as contained therein, afford an infallible testimony to their truthfulness. For "these are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through His name." John 20: 31.

## VII.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

ASSYRIOLOGY, ITS USE AND ABUSE IN OLD TESTAMENT STUDY. By Francis Brown. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1885.

This book is small in compass, but rich in contents and replete with interest. It is an address delivered by Prof. Brown, Sept., 1884, in accordance with the custom to have each year of study in the Union Theological Seminary, opened with a public discourse from one of its Faculty. The subject is one of momentous importance. The discoveries among the monuments of Assyria and Babylonia are so wonderful, that we may not be surprised if the expectation of new light to be cast upon the pages of God's Word has been raised to the highest pitch. This expectation has not been disappointed, and it will be still more fully realized in the future. There is danger, however, that zeal may outrun knowledge and brilliant conjecture do duty as severe fact. There is need, accordingly, of searching criticism. "Assyriology," as the author justly remarks, "has its guesses, and it has its accurate knowledge. It has felt the benefit of rigid critical examination at some points, and has suffered at others for lack of it. In some directions it has borne rich fruit for the Old Testament exegete, but has been allowed to do harm in others." A consideration, therefore, of some of the uses and abuses of Assyriology in Old Testament study is opportune and beneficial.

Prof. Brown is well fitted for this task. He is one of the very few in this country who have given special attention to the Assyrian language and literature. At the same time he is a Christian theologian, with a reverent faith in the supernatural character of God's revelation. These qualifications, joined with a carefully trained mind, a cautious judgment and a clear style, eminently fit him for the discussion of his theme.

He first takes up the abuses of Assyriology in Bible study, and traces their root to an ill-directed and excessive Apologetics. Apol-



ogetics has without doubt an important place in theological study ; but it may be questioned, he thinks, whether the Apologetic *temper*, always on the defensive, always looking for assaults, and prepared at the first blow to strike vigorously back—is a healthy frame of mind for a Christian thinker. “ It is likely to grow eager for certain *forms* of truth, rather than for the essential *truth*. It inclines to make no distinction between eternal verities and the forms of revelation in which those verities are embodied, and to venture the whole substance of the former upon its apprehension of the latter.” The author points out three abuses of Assyriology for the purpose of Old Testament study. The first is *overhaste in its employment*. He admits that Assyriologists themselves have been guilty of many sins of excessive haste in the intoxication of discovery. But the chief harm has been done by Biblical scholars, who have taken the hasty conclusions of specialists, and themselves drawn hasty conclusions from them. “ There has been a blind trusting to authority without weighing it, and an assumption of fact upon the mere say-so of some presumably honest scholar.” The unfortunate result of such precipitation he illustrates by several well-chosen examples. A second abuse of Assyriology is *the refusal to accept its clear facts* in the interest of some theory of interpretation. A good illustration of this is the hypothesis of a break in the Eponym Canon, on which the author dwells at some length. There must be no playing fast-and-loose with well-attested historical facts ; hailing them eagerly when they say at once what you want them to say, but discrediting them when their utterances are troublesome to you. “ It is a pity to be afraid of facts.” The third abuse of Assyriology is *to ignore the new problems* with which it confronts the Biblical scholar. It undoubtedly clears up many old difficulties, but unfortunately it gives rise to many new ones. These must be faced without prejudice and discussed without passion.

In discussing the uses of Assyriology, the author directs special attention to three. First, the *new setting* it gives to the ancient Hebrew literature and life by showing the racial connections of the people from whom the Old Testament has come. For, as he well remarks, “ it is a distinct and great advantage, when without lowering any of its unique claims, or any diminution of the special characteristics imparted to it by the divine agency in its production, the volume of sacred writings, before whose authority we bow, associates

itself more intimately, on its human side, with the history of mankind at large." Secondly, it *brings into clear light the essential difference between the Hebrews and other ancient peoples*. We soon discover in Assyrian literature the absence of that spirit which characterizes Hebrew literature. "There is a truth of spiritual conception, a loftiness of spiritual tone, a conviction of unseen realities, a confident reliance upon an invisible but all-controlling power, a humble worship in the presence of the Supreme Majesty, a peace in union and communion with the one and only God and the vigorous germs of an ethics reflecting His will, which makes an infinite gap between the Hebrew and his Semitic brother 'beyond the river' that all likeness of literary form does not begin to span." Thirdly, *Assyriology gives the strongest historical confirmation of Hebrew history*, and stamps the Old Testament annals as honest and accurate. This part of the book is well wrought out. Such is an outline-sketch of a book which we highly commend to all our ministers and more intelligent laymen, and in the reading of which, we doubt not, they will find much enjoyment.

PROPHECY AND HISTORY IN RELATION TO THE MESSIAH. The Warburton Lectures for 1880-1884. With two Appendices on the Arrangement, Analysis and Recent Criticism of the Pentateuch. By Alfred Edersheim, M. A. Oxon, D. D. Ph. D. Author of "Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah;" New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Company, 900 Broadway, Corner of Twentieth Street. London: Longman, Green & Co. 1885.

This volume is composed of twelve Lectures together with valuable notes and appendices. These Lectures were delivered by the author during the years 1880-1884 in the Chapel of Lincoln Inn on the foundation of Bishop Warburton. The question discussed in them is, from a religious point of view, of supreme interest and importance, as it concerns the very foundation of Christianity. Its treatment by Dr. Edersheim gives evidence of marked learning and ability on his part. His standpoint is the conservative one, but this does not cause him to ignore the results of modern criticism. On the contrary he gives careful consideration to the very latest views of Biblical critics, and even devotes two entire lectures and the two appendices to an examination of the theories of recent criticism in regard to the structure and order of the Old Testament, more especially of the Pentateuch legislation and the historical books, for the purpose of vindicating the Mosaic authorship of that legislation, and its ac-

cordance with the notices in the historical books. The conclusions at which he arrives, with some few exceptions, strike us as highly satisfactory.

Among the subjects especially considered in the volume, besides the one already referred to, are, the origin of Christianity in the Old Testament, the kingdom of God as the leading idea of the Old Testament, the faith and rites of the primitive Church, some fundamental principles regarding the study of prophecy and its fulfilment, prophetism and heathen divination, the spiritual element in prophecy, the Messianic idea in the later stages of Israel's history, the different movements of national life in Palestine in their bearing on the Messianic idea, analysis and contents of the pseudepigraphic writings and their teaching concerning the Messiah and Messianic times, and the last stage in the Messianic prophecy.

There are many things which our author says on the various subjects just mentioned to which we should like to call attention. Our space, however, will enable us only to present his views on a few points. "Christianity," he holds, "in its origin appealed to a great Messianic expectancy, the source and spring of which must be sought not in the post-exilic period, but is found in the Old Testament itself. The whole Old Testament is prophetic. Its special predictions form only a part, although an organic part, of the prophetic Scriptures; and all prophecy points to the kingdom of God and to the Messiah as its King. The narrow boundaries of Judah and Israel were to be enlarged so as to embrace all men, and one king would reign in righteousness over a ransomed world that would offer to Him its homage of praise and service. All that had marred the moral harmony of earth would be removed; the universal Fatherhood of God would become the birthright of redeemed, pardoned, regenerated humanity; and all this blessing would centre in, and flow from, the Person of the Messiah." With reference to prophecy he says: "Prophecy, in general—perhaps I should have said Prophetism—may, in the Biblical sense of the term, be defined as the reflection upon earth of the Divine ideal in its relation to the course of human affairs. According as the one or the other of these is the primary element, it refers to the future, or else to the present or the past." Again, "The Prophet, as preacher, views the present in the light of the future; as foreteller, the future in the light of the present. He points out present sin, duty, danger, or need, but all

under the strong light of the Divine future. He speaks of the present in the name of God, and by His direct commission; of a present, however, which, in the Divine view, is evolving into a future, as the blossom is opening into the fruit. And when he foretells the future, he sees it in the light of the present; the present lends its colors, scenery, the very historic basis for the picture." "The Messianic idea," he maintains, "is the moving spring of the Old Testament. It is also its sole *raison d'être*, viewed as a revelation, otherwise the Jewish people and their history could only have an archaeological or a political interest for us. Hebrewism, if it had any Divine meaning, was the religion of the future, and Israel embodied for the world the religious idea which, in its universal application, is the kingdom of God."

Though the work is not without defects, conspicuous among which are frequent repetitions and a want of strict logical order in the arrangement of the various parts, we can, nevertheless, heartily recommend it to our readers as a more than usually valuable contribution to theological literature, and as well worthy careful study.

THE MINOR PROPHETS, with a Commentary explanatory and practical, and introduction to the several books. By Rev. E. P. Pusey, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church. Vol. I., Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah and Jonah; Vol. II., Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1885.

Of the various commentaries in the English language on the Minor Prophets, there can scarcely be any question that the very best is that of Dr. Pusey. It is not only thoroughly orthodox, but it is at the same time also truly learned, able and instructive, practical and devotional. No one can study it without profit. The thanks of all Bible students are due to Messrs. Funk and Wagnalls for republishing it in a style so admirable and yet so cheap as that of the volumes before us. The work should have a place in the library of every minister and intelligent layman.

THIRTY THOUSAND THOUGHTS, being Extracts covering a comprehensive circle of religious and allied topics, gathered from the best available sources, of all ages and all schools of thought, with suggestive and seminal headings and homiletical and illuminative framework. The whole arranged upon a scientific basis, with classified and thought-multiplying lists, comparative tables, and elaborate indices, alphabetical, topical, textual, and Scriptural. Edited by the Rev. Canon H. D. M. Spence, M.A., Rev. Joseph S. Exell, M.A., Rev. Charles

Neil, M.A. Vol. III. X. Virtues including Excellence (second, third, fourth and fifth parts). XI. The Mosaic Economy. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1885.

The better we become acquainted with this work the better we are pleased with it. Each new volume impresses us more favorably than its predecessor, so that we are able more and more heartily to recommend it as a most valuable thesaurus of important and instructive thought.

The present volume, as indicated in the title page, consists of two sections. In the first of these sections (section x of the entire book) Justice, Wisdom, Benevolence and Self-Control are treated of; and in the second (Sec. xi) are considered in their various aspects the Tabernacle generally, the ministers and office-bearers in the service of the Tabernacle, and sacrifices and oblations including sacred festivals. The selections under these various heads have all been made with great judiciousness, and present a large amount of very useful information as well as many gems of thought gathered from many sources.

LETTERS FROM HELL. Given in English by L. W. J. S., with a preface by George MacDonald, LL.D. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1885.

This work was originally published in Denmark about eighteen years ago, and was at once translated into English, but it would seem attracted little or no attention. Very recently it appeared in a somewhat modified form in Germany, where it is said to have aroused almost unparalleled interest, running rapidly through a number of editions. The present volume is, with some slight alterations, a translation of the modified book as lately published in German. By Hell, the author does not mean Gehenna, but the Hades of the condemned; not the state of final punishment of the ungodly, but the state into which they enter immediately after death. The purpose of the work is not dogmatical but practical. In it accordingly there is no effort made to answer directly any question of the intellect. Its object is simply to portray in the way of warning, as vividly as possible, what may be rationally imagined to be the sad and woful experience of a lost soul after it has been separated by death from the body. The law of Hell we are told is, "we are not tormented—we torment ourselves!" The sinner brings nothing thither but himself. "And what comprises this self but a burning

remorse which can never be stilled ; a greed of desire which can never be satisfied ; an unquenchable longing for things left behind ; innumerable recollections of sins great and small, causing insufferable anguish, all being equally bitter, equally fraught with vainest regret." The book is one of more than ordinary power and originality, and is well calculated to awaken earnest and serious thought.

**PRaise SONGS OF ISRAEL.** A New Rendering of the Book of Psalms, by John De Witt, D.D., of the Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.; a member of the American Old Testament Revision Company. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1884.

This is in every respect an admirable book, and we heartily commend it to all who would more fully acquaint themselves with the meaning and beauty of the inspired Praise Songs of Israel. The object of the author in preparing it, was to present to English readers a translation of the Psalms into language that should render the original more faithfully, and yet more poetically. And this he has succeeded in doing. The translation he gives, it will be generally admitted by scholars, is more literal and faithful to the original, and also more rhythmical, than that of the version of the Psalms to which we are accustomed. Many obscure passages in consequence are made clear, and the poetic beauty of the original generally rendered more apparent. The ordinary reader will find the work of more service to him than any commentary in the way of helping him to a right understanding of this important portion of Sacred Scripture. The book on this account alone should find a place in every Christian home. In form and printing, we would yet add, this volume is very attractive and reflects much credit upon the publishers.

**THE SABBATH FOR MAN.** A Study of the Origin, Obligation, History, Advantages and present state of Sabbath observance with special reference to the rights of workingmen. Based on Scripture, Literature, and especially on a Symposium of Correspondence with persons of all Nations and Denominations. By Rev. Wilbur F. Crafts, A.M., author of "Successful Men of To-day," "Must the Old Testament Go?" "Rhetoric Made Racy," etc. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1885.

This volume which is a closely printed duodecimo of over six hundred pages, contains a large amount of valuable information on the subject of which it treats. In its pages the following questions

are thoroughly considered in all their bearings: Is the Sabbath surrendered? Is the Sabbath imperilled? Are Sabbath laws consistent with liberty? What of Sunday trains, Sunday mails, and Sunday newspapers? What degree of Sabbath observance can be realized in Nineteenth Century Cities? And, what can be done by Christians for the improvement of Sabbath observance? There is also an Appendix containing a large amount of additional matter bearing on the observance of the Sabbath. Ministers and others interested in securing the proper observance of the Christian Sabbath will find this a truly helpful book. It would be well if a copy of it could be placed in every family throughout our land.

**NEW LIGHT ON MORMONISM.** By Mrs. Ellen E. Dickinson, with Introduction by Thurlow Weed. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1885.

This volume gives a brief, succinct and graphic history of Mormonism from its inception to the present time. The author is a relative of Solomon Spaulding, from whose stolen manuscript "The Book of Mormon" was constructed. In her book a number of new facts concerning Mormonism are presented. Those who would thoroughly acquaint themselves with the history and character of one of the greatest and most mischievous delusions of modern times will find this small volume of especial service to them. It is well written and unusually interesting.

**LUDLOW'S CONCENTRIC CHART OF HISTORY.** Invented and Compiled by James M. Ludlow, D.D. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1885.

This is one of the most ingenious and helpful charts of history of which we have any knowledge. Within a small compass it furnishes a very large amount of interesting and very valuable historical information, so arranged as to be readily accessible. At a glance, indeed, it gives the separate and contemporaneous history of each century. Ministers and students generally will find it exceedingly convenient and labor-saving to have one of these charts always within easy reach.

**ANTHE.** By Mrs. G. W. Chandler. New York: Philips & Hunt; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1885.

**THE HALLAM SUCCESSION.** A tale of Methodist life in two Countries. By Amelia E. Barr. New York: Phillips & Hunt; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe.

These books are intended for young persons and are especially suited for the Sunday-school and family library. Both are well

written and interesting tales. Their object is to inculcate religious truth. The latter was especially prepared, as the author in the preface informs the reader, to assist young Methodists in giving a reason for the faith that is in them, and to show that they have good cause to love and honor their creed.

OXFORD LEAGUE SERIES. By Daniel Wise, D.D. New York: Phillips & Hunt; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe.

This series consists of seven small tracts treating of the following subjects: Ancestry of the Wesley Family; The Oxford Methodist Brotherhood; The Birthplace of Methodism; Methodist Converts in High Places; The Literary Work of the Wesleys; Place of Education in English Methodism; and, Place of Education in American Methodism. All these tracts have been prepared with care, and, in an unusually attractive style, give a large amount of useful and interesting information on the various subjects of which they treat.

SCRIPTURAL TEMPERANCE. An answer to the question, Is Total Abstinence from all Intoxicating Drinks as a Beverage, a Duty Enforced by the Teaching of the Bible? By the Rev. W. H. Ten Eyek, D.D. New York: Richard Brinkerhoff, No. 34 Vesey Street. 1885.

This is a pamphlet of forty-four pages octavo. The contents of it were originally prepared for, and read before the Ministers' Association of the Reformed Church in America. First the author inquires, What is Temperance? Then he considers the question of Scriptural Temperance, in relation to drink, both as regards wine and strong drink, by examining in order the various passages bearing on the subject in the Old and New Testament. His honest endeavor throughout is "to ascertain the sense of the Sacred Text, without regard to any preconceived system, and fearless of any possible consequences." The conclusion at which he arrives is, that,—"*Scriptural Temperance consists in self-control, in moderation in the use and enjoyment of any of the gifts of God's good providence; including that which, if taken to excess, will intoxicate.*" The pamphlet is deserving the careful consideration of all who desire to attain to the truth and nothing but the truth in regard to the question considered in it.